

# The Classical Review

AUGUST, 1913

## ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

### THE DISPERSAL LEGEND.

THE fashion seems to have prevailed during the lifetime of Herodotus and to a certain extent during that of Thucydides, of using stock explanations for subjects whose apparent similarity seemed to betoken a common origin.

To-day King Arthur is the typical stock explanation for certain regularly occurring natural features or peculiarities: so too, earthworks all over the length and breadth of Britain are referred unanimously to 'the times of the war,' that unsolved mystery which is the background of all Folk memory.

This deficiency in Folk memory of actual knowledge and detail was avoided with almost as much facility in Ancient Greece. Troy was the Lyonesse of the Greeks, and all things Trojan had to do with 'the times of the war.' In particular we find one phrase recurring with persistent regularity: *οἱ ἐκ Τροίης* is the phrase in question, and explanatory epithets are sometimes used, which show that it refers to the indigenous Trojans themselves, and not to their invaders. Thus in one place<sup>1</sup> they are the Trojans of the great Dispersal, *τῶν ἐκ Τροίης ἀποσκεδασθέντων*; and in another reference,<sup>2</sup> is made to the Trojans, *ὅκοτε συμμίσγοιεν τοῖσι Ἑλλήσι*.

Now the phrase seems simple enough to understand, but one is prompted to ask precisely what this Dispersal was. History is silent about it. We get

stories of the racial movements of the early half of the last millennium B.C.: we get faint echoes of Minoan culture, but beyond this one stock phrase, what do we know of the Dispersal? Is it a particular historical event confined to one spot, or is it a general belief as to a phase of civilisation—particularised perhaps in certain cases?

An examination of the cases where the phrase is used may throw light on the problem.

It occurs first in Herodotus in the fourth book.<sup>3</sup> In describing the tribes of Libya he mentions the Maxyes. The characteristics of this people are, firstly, that they shave their heads on the left side, secondly, that they smear their bodies with *μίλτος*; and thirdly, that they assert that they are of Trojan descent, *φασὶ δὲ οὗτοι εἶναι τῶν ἐκ Τροίης ἀνδρῶν*. The actual situation of this tribe is to the West of the river Triton in the Syrtis Minor and consequently not far from Sicily.

Now at first sight nothing seems more strange than that such an apparently savage people who have a peculiar method of hair-dressing and smear their bodies with red earth should have anything to do with Troy. But these peculiarities are not necessarily the signs of an excessively primitive culture. The peculiar mode of hair-dressing adopted by the Maxyes is not so very far removed

<sup>1</sup> Hdt., VII. 91.

<sup>2</sup> II. 120.

<sup>3</sup> Ch. 191.

from the head-dresses of the Lycians of the army of Darius. The use of *μίλτος* is of extreme interest. In historical times Cappadocia held a monopoly of the trade in *μίλτος*, which was known as 'earth of Sinope,' according to Strabo.<sup>1</sup> If, therefore, the *μίλτος* used by the Maxyes was the same as that of Cappadocia, there is one of two conclusions to be drawn: either Cappadocia did not hold a monopoly of this trade in early times, or the Maxyes had some sort of connection in commerce or custom with Asia Minor. Both might possibly be true if the actual *μίλτος* of the Maxyes was local and the use of it an imported custom.

In any case the connection between the Maxyes and Asia Minor which the use of *μίλτος* suggests seems all the more remarkable when we learn that they declared that they were of Trojan origin. Such a connection between the Troad and North-East Africa seems to be still further exemplified by a piece of independent evidence from Hissarlik. Twenty-three feet below the surface Schliemann unearthed a small pottery figurine of a hippopotamus.<sup>2</sup> It is of bright red colour and seems to be of local fabric. The depth of 23 feet seems enough to place it in the Neolithic stratum, but it is a pity that we do not know anything of the pottery with which it must have been associated. But the important point is that it represents a hippopotamus beyond any doubt, and Egypt could be the only possible place whence the subject could have been derived: as Schliemann says, 'At all events, Troy must have been commercially connected with Egypt; but even so it is still an enigma how the animal was so well known here [*i.e.*, at Hissarlik] as to have been made of clay in a form quite faithful to nature.' One is tempted to push this line of connection right down into Nubia, for the hippopotamus is not found below the rivers of the interior of Africa; but we have sufficient evidence that the hippopotamus existed in Upper Egypt in ancient times. Thus Hero-

dotus says<sup>3</sup> that they were worshipped as sacred animals at Papremis, and small clay or stone figures of hippopotami have been found in almost all the excavations of a pre-dynastic date—at Hierakonpolis, Abydos, Diospolis, and Gebelein.<sup>4</sup>

The second use of the phrase is in the fifth book of Herodotus.<sup>5</sup> The Paeonians, he says, were 'colonists of the Trojan Teucrians'—*εἴησαν Τευκρῶν τῶν ἐκ Τροίης ἀποικοί*. Now the Paeonians dwelt near the river Strymon, and the Strymonians, he says elsewhere,<sup>6</sup> were Thracians who were driven over into Asia by the Mysians and Teucrians, and were there called Bithynians. Their flight into Asia would almost seem as if they were driven by forces from the North rather than by forces from the Troad and the South. But the Mysians and Teucrians—whoever these names really represent—seem to have dominated the entire northern coast of the Aegean,<sup>7</sup> and so there is no reason why the Strymonians could not have fled in a south-easterly direction to escape their dominance.

But the fact which emerges from this reference to the Teucrians and from the two supplementary references to the Mysians and Teucrians combined is, that the upper half of the coast-line of Asia Minor and the Troad in particular seem to have been remarkable, chiefly for the number of tribal emigrations towards the West or North-West.

The Teucrians in particular seem to have been a people remarkable for their wanderings. Their home was nominally in Asia Minor. But after their expedition with the Mysians they took up their abode the other side of the Hellespont, near Abydos,<sup>8</sup> where they were known as Gergithes; but some of them remained in Asia Minor, for Darius came across certain *Γέργιθας τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας τῶν ἀρχαίων Τευκρῶν*.<sup>9</sup>

Now both the above references to *οἱ ἐκ Τροίης* leave the words *ἐκ Τροίης* to the interpretation of the reader. *ἐκ*, in

<sup>3</sup> II. 71.

<sup>4</sup> See Quibell, *Hierakonpolis*, I., Pl. XVIII. 18; Petrie, *Diospolis*, Pl. V. B. 101; *Abydos*, I., Pl. LIII. 35.

<sup>5</sup> Ch. 13.

<sup>6</sup> VII. 43.

<sup>7</sup> VII. 20.

<sup>8</sup> V. 122.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Strabo 540, and J. L. Myres on 'Pot Fabrics of Asia Minor,' in *J.A.L.*, 1903, p. 394.

<sup>2</sup> Schliemann, *Troy*, 1875, p. 228, fig. 159.

the ordinary Greek usage of the term, would mean 'from' Troy or 'of' Troy. But there seems some doubt whether this is precisely the shade of meaning intended in the phrase, for in two other references the *ἐκ* is amplified or explained, and it seems legitimate to suppose that when such explanation is absent it is implicitly understood.

The first of the latter references is in the seventh book of Herodotus.<sup>1</sup> Referring to the Pamphylian section of Xerxes' army, he says that οὗτοι εἰσὶ τῶν ἐκ Τροίης ἀποσκεδασθέντων ἅμα Ἀμφιλόχῳ καὶ Κάλχαντι.

Again we have the ominous tribal movements away from the Hinterland, probably southwards in the case of the Pamphylians; again the Troad is the point of departure. But this is the only reference where it is hinted that the emigration was made *under compulsion*. ἀποσκεδασθέντων means an enforced emigration under pressure of a superior power. The mention of Amphilochus and Calchas is of little importance; it was probably inserted as a hypothetical explanation of a subject which seemed to Herodotus to be rather obscure, and the mention of Troy in the folk history of the Pamphylians was quite enough to justify his bringing in Amphilochus and Calchas from Homer.

The fact that emerges, however, is that a certain tribe was compelled to retreat from its original home and get as far away from the centre of disturbance as possible.

The second reference occurs in the second book of Herodotus.<sup>2</sup> Discussing the origin of the Trojan war he refers to the Trojans—ὅκοτε συμμίσχοιεν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι. Now this is avowedly a reference to the Trojan war and to the subsequent scattering of the Trojans, but it may be that the historical Trojan dispersal was confused with a pre-historic and greater dispersal about which Greek historians preferred to be silent, or which they identified with the historical instance. In any case the assertion of a definite συμμείξεις τοῖσι Ἕλλησι of the Trojans may, in phraseology if in nothing else, re-

flect a previous and more important ἀποσκέδασις, and there seems little doubt but that the two dispersals have been confused, or rather the earlier one forgotten.

Thucydides<sup>3</sup> gives but one instance of the Dispersal Legend. After the capture of Troy, he says, a band of men fleeing from the Achaeans came by sea to Sicily, where they took up their residence near the Sikanians, and were known as Elymnoi. Their chief cities were Eryx and Egesta. Certain Phocaeans as well τῶν ἀπὸ Τροίας, who had set out for the same destination, were driven to Africa, but ultimately came and joined the Elymnoi.

Here we have the same story of a compulsory flight from Asia Minor and a settlement elsewhere. In outline the tale is identical with all those of Herodotus: first the pressure brought to bear on certain people, and then their abandonment of their domicile. It is only the names which might tempt one to treat the story as a true legend of Trojan times. But it is noteworthy that Thucydides is ignorant of the Asiatic name of the Elymnoi and gives only their Sicilian name; and further, the mention of Phocaeans is rather suspicious, for it was Phocaeans who at the time of the oppression of Ionia by Harpagus, and later after the failure of the Ionian revolt, fled over precisely the same route to Sicily and Sardinia. It is ever the tendency of Greek historians to interpret early history in the terms of later. But Thucydides must have realised that the story was older than the Trojan war, or he would have found some name for these mysterious Elymnoi—the *τινες τῶν ἀπὸ Τροίας* as he calls them—who had to wait till they got to Sicily before they got their name!

Here, then, we have references to four different tribes who were compelled by circumstances to flee from their native land in Asia Minor, and one general reference to a συμμείξεις of Trojans with mainland Greeks. One of these tribes went to Libya, one to Thrace; one went to a different part of Asia Minor, and one to Sicily; and each is referred to

<sup>1</sup> Ch. 91.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. 120.

<sup>3</sup> VI. 2.

independently of the other, so that there is little chance of their all being part of one historical exodus due to a single specific cause. They refer rather to a phase of history, to a period when certain stupendous forces were at work—forces whose importance is only beginning to be realised.

The problem is, what is this phase of history and what are these forces? Now in Greek Literature, as a whole, there is a strong tendency to use in a general sense proper names which have originally been used specifically. Thus the name Minos in Herodotus or Thucydides connotes anything connected with the old Thalassocracy of Crete; *Μηδισμός* and *κρησφύγετον* are words similarly formed, each being used generically, and not specifically. With these for precedents it does not, then, seem unlikely that 'Trojan' was used in an equally generic sense. Thus, to say that a certain tribe had sprung from 'fugitives from Troy' was, to a Greek, to imply merely that they had left Asia Minor under compulsion at some rather early date. There had been a great Dispersal, and Trojans were like the Jews of the later Roman Empire. The Troad, then, would mean the 'Hellenic' fringe of Asia Minor.

Now the physical characteristics of the coast of Asia Minor admit of only one kind of history. Men who were half native and half influenced by the culture which at all times thrived in the Aegean tried time after time to get a footing on the plain-lands and foot-hills of Asia Minor, with the ultimate intention, no doubt, of working their way up to the Hinterland through the river valleys. But the higher plateaux always conquered them: for beyond the foot-hills was always some dominant power which descended at intervals and cleared the coast of these enterprising invaders.

In the sixth century it was the Ionians who, with their half-Greek, half-Asiatic culture, tried to establish themselves permanently on the Anatolian coast; and it was the Persian forces who represented the dominant power of the Hinterland. Lade was the actual crisis and the beginning of the Dispersal. Dionysius, the Phocæan captain, followed the inevitable course of flight

to Sicily and the El Dorado of the West. The Samians and others did the same. This is the latest instance of the continually repeated formula—pressure from the Hinterland, followed by flight to every point of the compass except the East.

Before Lade it was again the Ionians who fled westwards before the powers of the Hinterland. But it was Cyrus this time instead of Darius. Again we find the Phocæans taking the lead in the emigration westwards, where they finally settled at Corsica. The famous advice of Bias of Priene emphasises still more the time-worn formula of flight. The inordinate praise bestowed by Herodotus on this advice seems rather out of place considering that the extremely orthodox belief Bias was advocating was the only logical solution which the natural features of Asia Minor offered to beleaguered coast towns.

Before Cyrus it was Croesus who acted the part of the aggressive mainland power, and it is here that chronicled history fails us in the details.

But we know that before Croesus the greatest dominating power of Asia Minor was that of the Hittite Empire. From the four passages of Herodotus and the one of Thucydides quoted above, it appears that at some remote date subsequently identified with that of the Trojan war there were movements of tribes from the coast of Asia Minor to the North and West and away from the East.

Does it not seem obvious, then, to connect the two, and to attribute to Hittite aggression these movements of tribes who had striven to live independently on the fertile but jealously guarded Anatolian coast-line? The actual evidence afforded by these passages is slight, and their value as unsupported accounts of historical facts is nearly negligible; but taken in conjunction with the argument from geographical features, and with the endless parallels in recorded history, it is not perhaps unreasonable to interpret the passages as giving one more glimpse into the history of that little-known power—the Hittite Empire.

S. CASSON.

*Lincoln College, Oxford.*



FURTHER NOTES ON HERODOTUS.<sup>1</sup>

1. 30 Τέλλω τοῦτο μὲν τῆς πόλεως εὖ ἡκούσης παῖδες ἦσαν καλοὶ τε κάγαθοί . . τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ βίου εὖ ἤκοντι, ὡς τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν, τελευτῇ τοῦ βίου λαμπροτάτῃ ἐπεγενέτο.

There is no natural connexion between his state's being prosperous and his having excellent sons, nor again between his being well off (for that is what τοῦ βίου εὖ ἤκοντι means) and his distinguishing himself in death. It looks as though τῆς πόλεως εὖ ἡκούσης and τοῦ βίου . . ἡμῖν should exchange places. Then his good circumstances and his good children, the success of his state and the victory in which he fell, are respectively well paired. Also τοῦ βίου ceases to be used twice in the same clause and within a few words.

1. 32 ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ εἶρέο με οὐ κῶ σε ἐγὼ λέγω, πρὶν ἂν τελευτήσαντα καλῶς τὸν αἰῶνα πύθωμαι.

κακὰ λέγειν τινά, etc., are one thing and such a construction as ἐκεῖνο . . οὐ κῶ σε λέγω another. Put σε before or after τελευτήσαντα.

*Ibid.* (end) ὅς δ' ἂν διατελέῃ καὶ ἔπειτα τελευτήσῃ.

We might have had διατελέσῃ . . τελευτᾷ, but τελευτήσῃ after διατελέῃ is hardly possible. Read διατελέσῃ . . τελευτήσῃ.

1. 35 ἔχοντι for ἔχοντος at the beginning? Cf. ἄγεται τῷ παιδί γυναικα above (but also ταῦτά οἱ νῦν μέλει of the *sen* below).

1. 59 γίγνεσθαι <δὲ> οἱ.

1. 143 (end) οὐδ' ἐδεήθησαν δὴ (for δὲ)?

1. 152 (end) ἀπερέοντα Κύρῳ Λακεδαιμονίων ῥῆσιν is so strange a phrase that one may wonder whether it can be a mistake for ἐρέοντα . . ἀπόρρησιν or ἀπόρρησιν . . ἐρέοντα. Cobet's ῥήμασι is not satisfactory.

1. 171 The τε after κατεστραμμένον? Stein's parallels are not very close.

*Ibid.* πάντες οἵπερ, 'all the very men who,' is meaningless here. Herodotus wrote πάντες ὅσοιπερ and ες fell out before οσ.

1. 196 ὡς ἂν αἱ παρθέναι γηνοίαιτο, though Hude retains it, is out of the question, because ἂν could have no place with such an optative of past frequency. Stein and Herwerden ὅσαι αἰεὶ for ὡς ἂν αἱ. ὅσαι for ὡς (a not uncommon confusion) is, I think, right, but for ἂν I would read δὴ. ὅσαι δὴ is a regular phrase.

Read also (οὐτῷ) δὴ ἄγεσθαι below for ἂν ἄγεσθαι (Stein ἀπάγεσθαι).

2. 11 κωλύσει for κωλύει would fit better with ἐθελήσει: 'what is to prevent?' Cf. 14 εἰ ἐθελήσει . . πεινήσουσι. No kind of mistake is more common.

2. 32 The καὶ before εἴ τι should be either omitted or placed after τι.

2. 56 Read ἐς Λιβύην πεπρήσθαι for ἐν Λιβύῃ, as in 54.

2. 71 <ἐν> νομῶ? The simple dative identifies the nome with its inhabitants in a very unlikely way. The words following may have caused the omission, but it could occur easily even without them.

2. 93 In *Xenophon and Others* p. 215 I explained the optative ἀμάρτοιεν as being due to the idea of an arrangement made by nature in the past. Something similar is 1. 53 ἐπειρωτᾷ εἰ . . . προσθέοιτο, i.e. he sent us to ask whether; the subjunctive being joined with the optative, as often with ἵνα or ὥπως after past tenses.

3. 136 I have suggested before that ἐκ (κ)ρηστώνης was a perversion of ἐς ῥηστώνην 'for D.'s relief.' I had not then noticed the phrase φυγῆς ῥαστώνην παρέχειν in Plutarch *Cam.* 20, which strongly supports my conjecture, being just what ἐς ῥηστώνην here would mean. In *Ar. Ach.* 412 I have suggested εἰς τραγωδίαν in place of ἐκ τραγωδίας.

4. 10 (end) Probably ταῦτα δὴ, and οὗτος δὴ at the end of 12.

4. 28 κενώριται κ.τ.λ. Madvig wished to insert the (unknown) word ἀντίτροπος after τρόπους to govern the dative. I think he was right in principle, but probably it was some ordinary word like ἐναντίως that dropped out.

4. 75 <περὶ> πᾶν τὸ σῶμα?

5. 3 ἀλλὰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἀπορὸν σφί καὶ

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. XIX., pp. 290-295 and 340-346 = *Notes on Xenophon and Others*, pp. 207-235

ἀμήχανον μή κοτε ἐν γένηται (so A B C, other MSS. ἐγγένηται).

I thought before of <οὐδὲ> μή κοτε, but I am inclined now to suggest ἐν γενέσθαι (or ἐγγενέσθαι), something like Thuc. 7. 29. 3 ἀπροσδοκήτοις (active) μὴ ἂν ποτέ τινα σφίσιν . . . ἐπιθέσθαι, the negative being superfluous in both.

6. 74 The Styx is described: ὕδωρ ὀλίγον φαινόμενον ἐκ πέτρης στάζει ἐς ἄγκος. φαίνόμενον coming into sight is a strange expression, and, as φαίνω and φέρω get exchanged, I conjecture φερόμενον. Cf. Plato *Phaedr.* 255C πηγὴ . . . πολλὴν φερόμενη. Water and wind are said φέρεσθαι.

6. 102 Many attempts have been made at emending κατεργέοντες. Has κατολιγωρέοντες ever been suggested? In sense it is very suitable.

7. 169. Should not ἐπιμέμφεσθε κ.τ.λ. be made a question?

7. 173 μεταξὺ δὴ for δέ?

7. 209 βασιλῆην τε καὶ πόλιν καλ. λίστην?

7. 219 αὐτόμολοι ἦσαν οἱ ἐξηγγείλαν?

7. 223 ἡ κατάβασις συντομωτέρη τέ ἐστι καὶ βραχύτερος ὁ χώρος πολλῶν ἢ περὶ ἢ περιόδος τε καὶ ἀνάβασις.

κατάβασις σ. and β. χώρος amount to exactly the same thing, except indeed in so far as χώρος does not mean a way, i.e. a distance, at all and is therefore an unsuitable word. Did not Herodotus write χρόνος? The words after ἢ περ are then used with a common ellipse.

9. 77 Perhaps ἄξιον . . . εἶναι, a construction of which Herodotus makes use.

9. 102 The ἔτι should be transferred not to stand before περιήσαν but to follow ἕως. ἕως ἔτι is frequent.

H. RICHARDS.

## CONJECTURES.

Propertius iii. 21. 26.

Inde ubi Piraei capient me litora portus,  
scandam ego Theseae brachia longa viae.  
Illic vel studiis animum emendare Platonis  
incipiam aut hortis, docte Epicure, tuis;  
persequar aut studium linguae, Demosthenis  
arma,  
librorumque tuos, docte Menandre, sales.

THE text of these lines is admittedly corrupt, and several emendations have been proposed; but, so far as I can ascertain, the most suspicious word has never been called in question at all. It is the allusion to 'the garden' that pulls the reader up short: so that Prof. Phillimore, for instance—who kept the reading printed above in his text—found himself obliged to adopt a conjecture when he proceeded to publish his translation. *Stadiis* (Broukhuyts) for *studiis* is paleographically an easy and obvious correction, but in the sense of 'walks'—'alleys' (Phillimore)—the word does not appear to occur elsewhere; whereas *studiis* is in itself unimpeachable: it supplies just the thought required. 'Haec studia . . . secundas res ornant, adversis perfugium ac solacium praebent . . . pernolant nobiscum, peregrinantur, rusticantur.' The garden was, it is true,

one of the sights of Athens, and would naturally attract a follower of Epicurus. So in the introduction to the fifth book of the *De Finibus* it is mentioned as a favourite resort of Atticus: 'At ego, quem vos ut deditum Epicuro insectari soletis, sum multum equidem cum Phaedro, quem unice diligo ut scitis, in Epicuri hortis, quos modo praeteribamus.' But it was hardly the *ιατρεῖον ψυχῆς*, in which Propertius could hope to get his wounds healed; . . . 'lenibunt tacito vulnera nostra sinu' (32 *infra*). The 'mythology' of the place was more likely to revive than to allay his passion.

In short, the context demands a reference, not to nature, but to literature, and we need only consult an Epicurean to obtain the clue.

In the proem addressed to Epicurus, with which the third book of the *De Rerum Natura* opens, occur the following well-known lines:

Tu, pater, es rerum inventor, tu patria nobis  
suppeditas praecepta, tuisque ex, inclute, chartis  
. . . omnia nos itidem depascimur aurea dicta.

Now Propertius had little enough in common with Lucretius, but as a lover of good poetry he may well have known the whole of this magnificent prelude

by heart. It contains much that would tend to fix it in the memory of an Umbrian. The morbid reflections on death could not fail to appeal to the author of *Quandocumque igitur* and *Sunt aliquid manes*. The three hundred libri, i.e. 'chartae,'<sup>1</sup> which Epicurus left behind him at his death,<sup>2</sup> were at least as famous as the garden itself, and an allusion to them is, in my view, what Propertius intended here.

In the next couplet we are on more difficult ground. But if 'studium' is corrupt—and the apposition is strange enough to warrant the supposition—it may well be a distortion of 'fulmen.'<sup>3</sup>

ὄργῃ Περικλῆς οὐλύμπιος  
ἡστραπτ' ἐβρόντα ξυνεκύκα τὴν Ἑλλάδα.  
(Ar., *Acharnians*, 531).

The king of orators has as good a right as the king of statesmen, or the king of the gods, to be endowed with the thunderbolt of eloquence. The metaphor is not unknown to prose: 'Stilus nec acumine posteriorum nec fulmine utens superiorum,' Cic., *Orator*, vi. 21. Cf. the use of 'tonare,' Cicero, *Orator* 29 and 'Proinde tona eloquio, solitum tibi' (Virgil, *Aen.* xi. 383); Cic., *Orator*, § 29.

In the next line it is probable that the corrupt 'librorum' (= 'librok') comes from a relique of some *deponent* future, possibly P.'s favourite 'Mirabor,' which has, I believe, already been suggested. Lastly, since 'docte Epicure' is probably sound (cf. Statius' 'docti furor arduus Lucreti'); 'docte Menandre' should perhaps give place to Kuinoel's fascinating conjecture, 'munde Menandre.' The whole four lines will then run thus:

Illic vel studiis animum emendare Platonis  
incipiam aut chartis, docte Epicure, tuis;  
persequar aut fulmen linguae, Demosthenis  
arma,<sup>4</sup>

miraborque tuos, munde Menandre, sales.

Plautus, *Rudens*, 86.

Pro di immortales, tempestatem quouismodi  
Neptunus nobis nocte hac misit proxuma.  
Detexit ventus villam—quid verbis opust?  
non ventus fuit, verum *Alcumena* Euripidi:

<sup>1</sup> Ellis on Catullus, I. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Wallace, *Epicureanism*, pp. 78-79.

<sup>3</sup> fulmen = flumen = flu(d)ium.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Sophocles, *Oed. Rex*, 170, φροντίδος ἔργος ᾧ τις ἀλέξεται.

ita omnis de tecto deturbavit tegulas—  
inlustriorem fecit fenestrasque indidit.

In view of passages like the *Bacchae*, 576-689 and *H. F.*, 874 *sqq.*, it may be felt that some generalisation would be more natural in this context, to suggest 'a storm such as blows in the pages of Euripides,' rather than the name of a single character (however demented) from a play that has perished. Such a generalisation might conceivably be conveyed in the words 'ruina (possibly Ruina<sup>5</sup>) Euripidi.' 'Ruina,' in the sense of 'cataclysm,' is used by Cicero (*Pro Cluentio*, 88 and 96), 'Ruinae similiore aut tempestati'; 'Ruina quaedam atque tempestas,' and it is applied by Horace (*Carm.* ii. 19. 15) to the destruction of the house of Pentheus in the play. In the Greek original, which Plautus was probably adapting, either the *ἔνσις* of *Bacchae*, 585 or the *θύελλα* of *H. F.* 905 may have been travestied thus. And the second syllable of 'vervm' might very easily be lost by haplography before 'RVINA.'

Such a loss would leave us—

NONVENTVSFVITVERVINAEURIPIDI.

I do not know what evidence there is of the intrusion of marginal glosses into the text of Plautus. But if we may assume that the allusion was explained by a reference in the margin to the 'Alcumenae filius,' it would not be unreasonable to suppose that the editor or corrector reduced the line to metre by interpreting the forlorn A in the text to mean 'Alcumena.' And that would give us the text we have. As it stood, the line had no true 'caesura,' the roughness of the metre suggesting the violence of the storm.

Cicero, *De Oratore*, i. 32. 146.

Verum ego hanc vim intellego esse in praeceptis omnibus, non ut ea oratores eloquentiae laudem sint adepti, sed, quae sua sponte homines eloquentes facerent, ea quosdam observasse atque *id egisse*: sic esse non eloquentiam ex artificio, sed artificium ex eloquentia natum.

The words 'id egisse' have been variously emended. Perhaps the context requires something like 'collegisse'

<sup>5</sup> The *Λύσσα* personified of the *Hercules Furens*.

(Nizolius), or 'redegisse' (Bake), to give the sense, 'reduce to a system.' Otherwise the 'ductus litterarum' might prompt the conjecture 'indagasse': 'they have not only noted points as they occurred, but further, *have tracked them out*.' Cicero is very fond of the word in its metaphorical sense, and Mommsen seems to be right in restoring 'indagamus' for 'id agamus' in the *Pro Milone*, xxii. 57.

Juvenal i. 144.

Hinc subitae mortes atque *intestata* senectus.

Mr. Housman's note gives an excellent sense—better far than can be obtained by the theory that the words form a hendiadys, 'The sudden death that overtakes *old* men before they have made their wills',—Juvenal's whole point being that the men never reach old age at all. But it is hard to believe that a writer who uses the word shortly afterwards (iii. 274) in its usual sense would give it an otherwise unheard-of meaning here. To get the sense required we must emend, and if it is the verb that is corrupt, I would suggest '*intercepta*,' 'That is why old age is denied to men.' The verb is a favourite with Ovid, whose usage Juvenal often follows. And a dittography of the last syllable may have transformed '*intercepta*' into '*intestata*.' '*Intentata*' (E. C. Corelli, *C. R.* xix. 305) is palaeographically easier, but the word is perhaps less effective.

Virgil, *Aeneid*, iii. 454.

Hic tibi ne qua morae fuerint dispendia tanti,—  
quamvis increpitent socii et *vi cursus* in altum  
vela vocet possisq; sinus implere secundos,—  
quin adeas vatem.

For the difficulties of the Vulgate see translations and commentaries. Virgil has brought his voyagers to Cumae, on the Campanian coast, and as their ultimate destination is Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber, a wind that would serve them well is the S.S.E., *i.e.* in pure Latin 'Vulturnus' or 'Vulturinus' (Lucretius v. 745; Pliny ii. 47. 46. § 119; Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, ii. 229 *et seq.*).

Do the words italicised—both of them abnormal in this context—conceal the rare word 'Vulturnus,' which would be so singularly appropriate here? Cf. 'supra,' line 70, 'Lenis crepitans vocat Auster in altum.' If the initial V were lost by haplography, the suggested corruption might easily develop. In 'rustic capitals' the syllables VL and VI are almost indistinguishable,<sup>1</sup> and VL TVRNVS would tend to become VI CVRSVS by the same process, which transformed 'Pal-aestinique' into 'palam est vidique' in the MSS. of Statius, *Silvae*, ii. 1. 161, and which led to the variants 'alter Apollo' (R), and 'alter ab illo' (P) in Virgil, *Eclogues*, V. 49.

D. A. SLATER.

Cardiff.

<sup>1</sup> See M. Chatelain's preface to the Leyden edition of the *Codex Oblongus* of Lucretius, p. vii.

### HIDDEN QUANTITIES.

'No one will wish to deny that there is still, and always will be, a deal of uncertainty regarding hidden quantities, that there are many cases where the evidence is so meagre or so conflicting that our conclusion is scarcely more than arbitrary. Indeed some matters about which our books agree are nothing like so certain as would appear from this agreement.' These words, coming from so high an authority on this subject as Professor Buck (*Classical Review*, vol. xxvii., June, 1913, p. 123), deserve to be carefully pondered by those who undertake the responsibility

of introducing indications of hidden quantities into school books; for it is exceedingly difficult to draw the line between these doubtful cases and the 'cases about which there is no reasonable doubt, even if recent books do differ.' What the *modus operandi* of the writer of school books ought to be must be determined mainly by didactic considerations, as to which opinions will differ. I personally am not satisfied with the spirit of Professor Buck's note indicating his readiness to 'teach dogmatically some quantities which are really doubtful.' But what we are



concerned with here is the question of scientific fact. In my article in vol. xxvi., p. 79 f., I expressed no opinion upon a number of points which Professor Buck has discussed in detail on pp. 124-126 of his article, and I still feel myself incompetent to throw any light upon them. In many cases the question is one for the Romance philologist rather than for the student of Latin to determine. But in regard to the questions which I discussed in my first article (p. 78 f.) I have something to say in reply to Professor Buck's contention on the other side.

1. As to the quantity of the *e* in certain forms of *edo*, it is true that the late Professor Skutsch in a brief article (*Glotta* III, p. 386) which appeared subsequently to the writing of my article quoted as evidence running counter to his previous contention in *Glotta* I, p. 115, and *Forschungen zur Lat. Gramm.* I, p. 60, n., the fact that the infinitive *esse* 'to eat' is transliterated in one passage of a second-century<sup>1</sup> cursing-tablet (No. 267 of Audollent's collection) in the form *ησσε*, i.e. with the first vowel long; and he appeared to attach importance to this fact, quoting from Audollent the statement that *η* always stands for *ē* in that tablet. I confess I read this note with astonishment; for though *η* is used correctly for *ē* in two or three other words (e.g. *μη* = *mē*, and *διηβους* = *diēbus*), yet the writer spells *vidēret* as *ουιδερετ* and *suae* as *σουε*; and though his *ω* mostly<sup>2</sup> stands for *ō*, yet he does not hesitate to spell *nōn* as *νον*. Either, then, his use of the Greek letters was inconsistent or his pronunciation of Latin was incorrect. And if the transliterations in other tablets in this volume are examined, they will be found to contain blunders which surely put them out of court as evidence on Latin pronunciation, apart from the fact that all the tablets containing transliterations date from the first, the second, or the third century of our era. Thus I find on a cursory examination *η* written for *ε* in *ουιξηριτ* (= *vixerit*),

No. 304 (p. 425), of the first century; *ε* for *η* in *ουιδερετ*, No. 304, *δε* (= *dē*) and *με* (= *mē*), No. 269, of the third century; *νε* (= *nē*) and *δεσιδεριο* (= *dē-sideriō*) and *δεσχενδο* (= *dēscendō*), No. 270, of the second century; *ε* for *αι* or *οι* in *Διονυσίε* (= *Dionysiae*) and *Ἀμένε φίλιε* (= *Amoenae filiae*), No. 270; *ω* for *ο* in *εγω* (= *ego*), No. 270; *ο* for *ω* in *οκ λοκο* (= *hōc locō*) and *οκ μομεντο* (= *hōc mōmentō*) and *ατιουρο* (*adiūro*), No. 231, of the first century; *κορονα* (= *corōna*), No. 252, of the first century; *ανιμο* (= *animō*) and *κογιτετ* (= *cōgitet*) and *αμορε* (= *amōre*), No. 269, of the third century; *αμορε* occurs also in No. 270. On the other hand there are plenty of instances in which the Greek letters are used correctly: e.g. *ρηγίς* (= *rēgis*), *αμωρε*, *ανιμω*, in No. 231—the same tablet as contains *οκ λοκο*, etc. The tablets composed in Greek also contain blunders, such as *φρήνας* and *πόσον* (for *παῦσον*) in No. 252.<sup>3</sup> One of those composed in Latin (not transliterated) exhibits *hanimam et ispiritum* (= *animam et spiritum*)—No. 250, of the third century. I say nothing about solecisms of accident and syntax, of which Audollent gives a list on pages 543-549. These tablets are the work of ignorant persons, who scribbled a curse on a piece of lead, with an invocation of half a dozen demons with fearsome names such as *Achrammachalala* to bring about the accomplishment of their desires, and dropped it into some place of burial, as into a *boîte aux lettres*,<sup>4</sup> in the hope that it would arrive at its destination in the infernal regions. Those referred to above were found at Carthage or Hadrumetum. The argument in favour of *ēst*, *ēsse*, etc., must be in a bad way if it has to rely on support of this kind. Nor do I attach any serious importance to the writing of *est* with a mark over the *e* in a fifth-century papyrus.

2. Professor Buck somewhat misrepresents my statement as to the pronunciation of the vowels before *ns* and *nf*. I never suggested that the 'nasal element was wholly lacking' in the pronunciation of such words as *consul*,

<sup>1</sup> See Audollent, p. 556.

<sup>2</sup> Not always: for *σωαδ* . . . (vel *σωαδ* . . .) apparently represents some form of the word *sōdalis*. There is, I think, no Latin word which begins with the letters *sōad*.

<sup>3</sup> This tablet is mainly in Greek, but partly in Latin.

<sup>4</sup> Delattre, *Rev. Arch.*, quoted by Audollent, p. cxi.

*infans*. On the contrary, I said that when the *n* was dropped the *vowel* before it was at the same time nasalised (vol. xxvi., p. 79). This is the view that has generally been held by philologists. Professor Buck does not agree with it, holding that a *consonantal n* was pronounced, at any rate in the later stages of the language. There the matter must rest. The point is one on which we can get no further unless new evidence is forthcoming. I have none such to offer; but I cannot resist the temptation of an 'ad hominem' argument. If Audollent's cursing tablets are evidence as to Latin pronunciation, they may be quoted in

support of a *short vowel* before *ns*; for the word *furens* is transliterated in at least two passages as *φουρενς*! See No. 270, of the second century. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Professor Buck may then take his choice. Either the cursing tablets are evidence, and then go to show that the *e* of words like *furens* was short; or they are no evidence, and then cannot be quoted in support of a long *e* in *esse* 'to eat.'<sup>1</sup>

E. A. SONNENSCHIN.

30, Calthorpe Road, Edgbaston.

<sup>1</sup> No. 267, containing the solitary instance of *ησσε*, is of the same date as No. 270.

## NOTES

AESCHYLUS, *SEPTEM*, 745 ff.  
(OXFORD TEXT).

Ἀπόλλωνος εὔτε Λαίος  
βία, τρὶς εἰπόντος ἐν  
μεσομφάλοις Πυθικοῖς  
χρηστηρίοις θνάσκοντα γέν-  
νας ἄτερ σώζειν πόλιν,  
κρατηθεῖς δ' ἐκ φίλων ἀβουλιᾷ  
ἐγείνατο μὲν μόρον αὐτῷ,  
πατροκτόνον Οἰδιπόδαν.

THE dramatic motive of the triple repetition of the oracle is obvious. It emphasises the warning.

As the Scholiast rightly, if somewhat unctuously, remarks, τὸ φιλάνθρωπον τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ τρὶς ἐμφαίνει—and of course the criminal folly of Laïos in disregarding the warning. But the triple utterance has worried German scholars. Wecklein apparently wished to suggest that Apollo did not deliver the prophecy three times, but 'said it very loud and clear.' Staehlin (*Das Motiv der Mantik im antiken Drama*, p. 22, n. 3) points out that the analogy of adjectives like *τρισάμβλιος*, *τρίσμακαρ*, *τρισάθλιος*, *τριτάλας* does not hold, and that the text must mean that Apollo delivered the oracle three times. He concludes 'dass die Dreizahl auch hier sehr wohl ihren Platz hat, so gut wie in hunderten von anderen, auf Kultus und Theologie sich beziehenden Dingen, liegt auf der Hand.'

Apparently what has troubled the Philologen is the fact that a statement is made by the oracle three times over; either this must be explained away, or else it refers to theological tenets. They have been unnecessarily perturbed. If we examine historical usage we see that the triple utterance is not an *atopon*. Firstly, take the case of the Alkmaeonids and Sparta. Here the god—for a consideration, it is true—repeats his message many times, not merely thrice, without being asked for it.<sup>2</sup> Apollo evidently reserved the right to publish matters of importance as often as he thought fit. Secondly, cases, which are perhaps more *ad rem*, are not unknown, where the question is repeated in the hopes of a more favourable answer. The famous historical instance is, of course, the occasion on which the Athenians, prompted by an official hint, reopen the question of their fate in

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, VI. 63: ὡς ὃν δὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι, οἷτοι οἱ ἄνδρες ἐν Δελφοῖσι κατήμενοι ἀνέπειθον τὴν Πυθίην χρήμασι, ὅπως ἔλθοιεν Σπαρτιητέων ἄνδρες εἴτε ἰδίῳ στόλῳ εἴτε δημοσίῳ χρησόμενοι, προσφέρων σφὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐλευθεροῦν. Apollo had of course no scruples in answering off the point or supplementing his answer to the questioner. Cf. Herodotus, IV. 150, *χρεωμένῳ δὲ τῷ Γρίνῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Θηραίων περὶ ἄλλων χρᾶ ἢ Πυθίῃ κτίζειν ἐν Λιβύῃ πόλιν*, and Herodotus, IV. 155 (Battos), *ib.* IX. 33 (Teisamenos). He even uttered an oracle about Miletos to the Argives when no Milesian was present (Herodotus, VI. 19).

relation to the Persian peril.<sup>1</sup> It is a human weakness to try again, if the first answer goes against you. We find it regularly the practice in another field of divination. In military extispication, if the first examination gives an adverse verdict, the general is at liberty to try twice more. If the second or third examinations are in his favour, the omens are held to be propitious in spite of his former essays.<sup>2</sup> I cannot therefore see the difficulty in *τρίς εἰπόντος*, or suppose that a Greek audience saw anything so strange as to need explanation or emendation in the statement that Apollo delivered his message to Laïos three times.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

*The University, Glasgow.*

ARISTOTLE, *HIST. AN.* 4. 8.  
533<sup>b</sup> 17.

ἀλλ', ὅταν κατανοήσωσιν ἓν τινα τόπον πολλοὺς ἀθρώους ὄντας (δελφίνας), ἐκ τοσούτου τόπου τεκμαιρόμενοι τὰ δίκτυα καθίαισι, ὅπως μήτε κώπης μήτε τῆς ῥύμης τῆς ἀλιάδος ἀφίκεται πρὸς τὸν τόπον ἐκεῖνον ὁ ψόφος.

In the recently published number 64 of the *Journal of Philology* Prof. Henry Jackson denies the possibility of these words meaning *at such a distance that no noise shall reach*. As it happens, both of the points on which I imagine his denial to rest can be paralleled against him from the *Politics*. (1) *Pol.* 6. 4. 1319a 8 ἡ τὸ ὅλως μὴ ἐξεῖναι κεκτῆσθαι πλείω γῆν μέτρον τινὸς ἢ ἀπὸ τινος τόπου πρὸς τὸ ἄστυ, where the last words clearly mean *at a certain distance from the city*, in antithesis to *ὅλως (anywhere) at all*. (2) For the very unusual *τοσούτος ὅπως* cf. *Pol.* 1. 13. 1260a 35 ἀρετῆς δέεται μικρὰς καὶ τοσαύτης ὅπως μήτε δι' ἀκολασίαν μήτε διὰ δειλίαν ἐλλείψῃ (or ἐλλείψει) τῶν ἔργων. Dr. Jackson's change of *ἐκ τοσούτου τόπου* to *ἐκτὸς τοῦ τόπου* is therefore not necessary. *τεκμαιρόμενοι* too would have less force with it.

H. RICHARDS.

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, VII. 141.

<sup>2</sup> Xenophon, *Anabasis*, VI. 4, 16, *θυομένην δὲ πάλιν εἰς τρίς ἐπὶ τῇ ἀφῶδῳ οὐκ ἐγίγνετο τὰ ἱερά*. Cf. *ib.* VI. 4, 19, VII. 6, 44.

XEN. *ATH. POL.* II. 12.

πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἄλλοσε ἄγειν οὐκ ἐάσουσιν οἷτινες ἀντίπαλοι ἡμῖν εἰσιν ἢ οὐ χρήσονται τῇ θαλάττῃ.

A satisfactory sense might be obtained of this difficult passage if it were considered permissible to take *ἄλλοσε* as equivalent to *πρὸς ἄλλους*, to which *οἷτινες* will then refer by a *constructio ad sensum*. 'The dependant cities will not allow these to be carried elsewhere to our rivals, or if they do, they (the dependant cities) shall not have the use of the sea.'

F. BROOKS.

*University of Bristol.*

PICTURES OF CAESAR'S  
TRIUMPHS.

(See *C.R.*, pp. 126-129.)

It may be worth while to offer a few conjectures on the interesting text published by Messrs. Evelyn-White.

Fol. xli.a, l. 7: 'ex gallis subactis'?

*Ib.* l. 8: 'ex victo necatoque ptolomeo rege. . .'

Fol. xliii. [misprinted xliiii.] a. 1: 'legionumque' for 'legio nunquam'?

Fol. xliiii.a. 2: 'for 'āte victi' read either 'āte victi' ('ante vincti', 'with their hands tied in front of them,' as they are pictured in one of the cuts), or, if that is not good enough Latin, 'arte vincti' ('tight bound').

In all these points the fault is the book's, which the transcribers have very kindly allowed me to inspect. They wish me to add the following corrections of their transcript:

Fol. xli.a, l. 4, insert 'sed' before 'interiectis'; *ib.* 'rursū' (= 'rursum?'); l. 9, 'ptolomeo'; b. 2, 'viasque.'

Fol. xliii.a. 2, 'subinde boues'; b. 1, 'leuaque.'

Fol. xlii.a. 2, 'portaret' and 'sertis.'

Fol. xliiii.a. 1, 'victorie'; a. 2, 'capitui nobiliores.'

Fol. xlv.a. 2, l. 2, 'post quam'; l. 9, 'veta' (with no contraction-mark).

E. HARRISON.

*Trinity College, Cambridge.*

NOTE ON QUINT. I. vii. 29.

*Nec 'Gnaeus' eam litteram in praenominis nota accipit qua sonat, et 'colum-*

nam' et 'consules' *exempla n littera legimus.*

This passage has been quoted by various writers on Latin 'Lautlehere' as evidence that the *n* in *consul* was not pronounced. It is current as evidence for *co'sul*. Does it really prove that, or the opposite?

'Legimus' I take to mean here 'We find *consules* written without *n*.' So Spalding took the passage; he was aware of course that Quintilian must have seen COS standing for 'consul,' and he adds the suggestion that Quintilian said 'consules' (in the plural) because he had so often seen it stand for 'consulibus.' He does not give arguments in support of his view; probably he had met with no other view of the passage. But there are arguments for it.

It is in agreement with the general use of *legere*; *lego* is to scan, pick up or scrutinise written letters, making words of them (*ἀναγρῶναι*, in Ionic *ἐπιλέξασθαι*). 'qua legor Oenone falce notata tua.' There is no question of this being read aloud. The letters can be seen traced on a tree by Paris' knife. There are passages where *lego* does mean to read aloud (*tenet occiditque legendo—ruptae lectore columnae*), but it is the context or the situation, not the word itself, that conveys this sense. The English word 'read' misleads us about the Latin word. 'He read the letter to the Senate'; that is *litteras recitavit*, but not many pupils will put it so in a piece of composition. To pronounce is *pronuntiare* or *enuntiare*.

Secondly, if Quintilian was speaking of a general principle of pronunciation—*n* disappearing before *s* or *f*—why out of all possible words did he select *consul*? and why put it in the plural? Further, to think of COS is just what he would be likely to do, after speaking of C and CN as symbols for Gaius and Gnaeus.

For these reasons it seems to me quite impossible that he can mean by *legimus* 'we pronounce.' The passage shows that the *n* was pronounced. The paragraph § 28-29 begins 'quid? quae scribuntur aliter quam enuntiantur.' But an objection may be taken; it may be said 'Is not the text of the passage so dubious that it is unsafe to infer anything from it? There is another read-

ing et *clarissimos et consules geminata eadem littera legimus.* And in the text usually accepted there is *columnam* as well as *consules*. What is that?

I do not know what *columnam* is. It may be that in an architect's accounts or in contracts for public buildings CLM could be seen standing for *columna* or *columnae*. But that is a mere conjecture. *clarissimos* etc. is, I think, an 'adscript' of the third or fourth century, which has been mistaken for a variant in the text itself. COSS (*consules* with the same letter S twice) is said to occur first in rustic Christian inscriptions of the second century. So probably Quintilian had not seen it; and it is unlikely that he had seen a contraction for the plural of *vir clarissimus* (CC, the same letter twice). A later reader or copyist noted these as further examples of what Quintilian was describing, and appended them on the margin.

W. R. HARDIE.

POSTSCRIPT.—After writing this, I consulted my friend Dr. George Macdonald about contractions for *columna*. He suggested that a contraction for *Columna Regia* might be found on milestones of South Italy, where this was a well-known landmark, and I then asked a member of my Advanced Class (Mr. J. F. Marshall) to make a search in the C.I.L. But the extant inscriptions from South Italian milestones proved to be very few, and after pursuing the quest carefully in other quarters, Mr. Marshall found nothing to report except the occurrence of COL for *columna* on a *Tabula cerata* from Pompeii. COL does not quite account for Quintilian's Text, for it lacks both *m* and *n*; but Quintilian sometimes chooses his illustrations in an odd way, and it is possible that it was in his mind.

If Quintilian's evidence is that the *n* was pronounced, the pronunciation *cōsul* or *cō'sul* seems to be relegated to Vulgar Latin, and it need give no further trouble to teachers or Classical Associations. It remains as a problem of historical 'Lautlehere.' A survey of the evidence collected in Diehl's *Vulgärlateinische Inschriften* shows that the omission of *n* is frequent not only before *s* but before *t* (*mereti, testameto*), and is found also before *c*, *d*, *g* and *q* (*ponedum, pricipi*). The converse error of writing *n* where it is not required—an error sure to follow, when *on* was thought of as a way of representing *ō*—is found chiefly before *s*, seldom before other letters. This seems to differentiate *ns*, and to help to account for Cicero's special mention of the length of the vowel before it. But I observed no example of *n* omitted before *ns*, which Cicero also mentions.

However, Diehl's collection does not profess to be exhaustive, and the matter admits of further investigation.



## REVIEWS

## GRUNDZÜGE UND CHRESTOMATHIE DER PAPYRUSKUNDE.

*Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde.* By L. MITTEIS and U. WILCKEN. 2 vols. 8vo., each of 2 parts. Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1912. M. 40; bound M. 48. The parts may also be had separately at a somewhat higher rate.

THIS important work, the plan of which was announced eight years ago, supplies a long-felt want. The last two decades have been a period of extraordinary activity in the discovery and publication of the Greek papyri of Egypt. This wealth of documentary material has been examined and discussed from special points of view in various monographs which have recently been appearing on the Continent with increasing frequency. But we have had no general survey of the field, no adequate introduction to the study as a whole. In 1900, indeed, the first part of an *Einführung in die Papyrskunde* was published by O. Gradenwitz, who, however, made no profession of treating the subject on its historical side, and has never proceeded with his book. That two so high authorities in their respective departments as Mitteis and Wilcken should now have combined to fill, if but temporarily, the gap, is a matter for much satisfaction; the product of their labours will be of the greatest service, not only to the novice approaching the study of papyri, but also to the specialist as a summary of results so far obtained and as a starting-point for fresh research.

For of course as yet, while so much material remains to be edited, and what has been edited awaits exhaustive analysis, nothing like finality is attainable. As Wilcken remarks in his first chapter (p. 1), we are still but at the beginning. Only too many illustrations of that warning are to be found in these volumes; and even in the short time that has elapsed since their issue, new evidence has brought fresh light on more than one question. For instance, the current view of the 'publication' of

privately-drawn contracts is seriously disturbed by P. Oxy. 1208, and P. Leipzig 28 (Mitteis, No. 363) is happily no longer the sole example of a contract of adoption. A critic in one of our leading periodicals lately committed himself to the singular opinion that 'we have seen more than enough' of the business documents of Roman and Byzantine Egypt. A more profound misconception of the importance of the subject, and of the existing state of our knowledge, can hardly be imagined. There are few fairly-preserved papyri from which something cannot be extracted; the uses to which mere lists of personal names can be turned are well pointed out by Wilcken on p. 104. It is highly improbable that the scientific investigator will ever have 'seen more than enough' Greek papyri of any period. Moreover, the already extant collections are to no small extent an unworked quarry; Wilcken's pages especially are prolific in suggestions of subjects for further study, which may be commended to the attention of aspirants to the doctorate. One of the writer's avowed objects is to attract new workers to this fruitful field; may that purpose be fulfilled, and may they not be drawn exclusively from Continental sources! And this pious wish leads on to another, namely, that the new edition of the *Papyrskunde*, to which Mitteis himself already looks forward (Introd., p. v), and which assuredly will be called for at no distant date, may be accompanied by an English translation.

Literary papyri are not included within our authors' scope, neither do they undertake to deal with the non-literary documents on their philological side. They address themselves to the two largest departments of papyrology—the historical (in a wide acceptation of the term) and the legal. Mitteis of course devotes himself to the latter, Wilcken to the former; and the work of each is subdivided into two sections—the *Grundzüge* or broad outlines of the subject, and a *Chrestomathie* containing

a long series of collected texts, to which the *Grundzüge* is introductory. In an excellent preliminary chapter Wilcken states the main facts concerning the discovery of the papyri, enumerates the editions, and discusses concisely matters of palaeography, language, chronology, numismatics, and metrology. A general historical sketch follows, embracing the Ptolemaic, Roman, Byzantine, and Arabic periods, and these main divisions are so far as possible separately considered in the succeeding chapters, which treat of religion, education, finance, industry and commerce, agriculture, forced labour and liturgies, food-supply, post and transport, military and police organisation, and social life. For some of these topics the ground had already been well prepared—e.g. for financial administration by his own *Ostraka*, for religion by Otto's elaborate *Priester und Tempel*, for agrarian questions by Rostowzew's *Römisches Kolonat*. With regard to others his part is sometimes rather that of the pioneer; but on all he writes with abundant knowledge and admirable lucidity, and though the book is not free from signs of haste, it is seldom that material points appear to have been lost sight of, as, for instance, in the discussion of the abandonment of certain outlying villages in the Fayûm (pp. 324-5), the immediate cause of which was presumably the failure to maintain an effective water-supply.

Mitteis's First Part is somewhat shorter. The subjects of his chapters are: The legal procedure of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods (i.-ii.); the different types of documents (iii.); the registration of real property (iv.); and the forms and usages involved in the principal legal transactions—loan and mortgage, sale, lease of land, marriage and succession (v.-ix.). Chapter x. is concerned with guardianship, xi. with a variety of minor transactions—deposit, representation, security, division of property, manumission, adoption, etc.; while a final chapter gives a useful account of a number of edicts which bear on points of law and had not been discussed in the preceding pages. The erudition and discrimination that would be expected from so eminent

a jurist are conspicuous throughout. He is less easy to read than Wilcken, chiefly on account of a frequent use of technical language, which in a book of this type, professedly designed to be an introduction, might well have been more carefully excluded. Another defect, which is not less evident in Wilcken's volume, is the inadequacy of the indices; this, at any rate, can easily be remedied in a new edition.

The selected texts, of which Wilcken prints some 500 and Mitteis 382, are supplied with explanatory introductions and short footnotes, but not, as was originally proposed, with translations. They have been judiciously chosen, but it is unfortunate that Wilcken felt himself obliged to abstain from drawing upon the papyri to be included in his forthcoming *Urkunden der Ptolemaerzeit*, a re-edition which has long been promised, and seems at last to be on the point of appearance, of the Ptolemaic documents published prior to about 1890. Use is made of several texts which had not previously been printed—in Wilcken's volume Nos. 26, 43 introd., 139, 217, 238, 308, 341, 392, 412-13, 469; in that of Mitteis, No. 71. It is regrettable that some pages are defaced by a profusion of underlined letters. The utility of this recently introduced refinement is questionable even in an *editio princeps*, for if a letter can be read with security, of what interest is the fact that it is imperfectly preserved? At any rate such meticulous accuracy is out of place in a handbook of selections. Exception may also be taken to the employment of  $\omega$  to represent the fraction of  $\frac{1}{3}$  (e.g., Mitteis, *Chrestom.*, p. III). No doubt in cursively written fractions  $\beta$  and  $\delta$  often have alike the form of a small  $\omega$ , but the literal reproduction of this in a modern text is an absurdity. Similarly *ibid.* p. 181 it would be well to save a note and print  $\sigma$  for 200 instead of an unfamiliar approximation to the actual symbol used by the scribe. The introduction of uncial type *ibid.* p. 427 seems pointless; mutilated passages are not so given elsewhere.

The texts are skilfully handled, and often show advance on their condition as originally edited. Here again we are

far from perfection, and with the publication of fresh material and the progress of knowledge further improvements will continually be possible. A few miscellaneous details noted in a first perusal are appended. Wilcken No. 28. 16, *φρόντισον κ.τ.λ.* is the apodosis and should be preceded by a comma, not a full stop. 46. 10, *συστά[τη]* is clearly to be restored; cf. P. Oxy 116. 5, note. Proofs of the existence of a so-called Northern quarter at Hermopolis, whereon an argument is based in 143 introd., have yet to be produced. Why is 148, a Tebtunis papyrus, stated to have been found at Oxyrhynchus? In the indications of provenance generally, more consistency of method might have been observed with advantage. 238. 11, 1. *παραφυλάξετε*, not *παραφυλάξε* (= -αι) τε, ὅτι being understood after *πέπεισμαι δέ*. In 349. 24 the editor's conjecture is nearly correct: 1. *ἐάν τι μὴ δέοντως γένηται*. In l. 22 the emendation *ἀκόλουθον* is wrong, but I cannot yet supply a suitable reading. 368. 28, the insertion of *τῶν* is unnecessary. 374. 23-4 is to be restored on the analogy of a papyrus

in the possession of Prof. Gradenwitz *ἐπιστεῖλαι* (?) *οἷς καθήκει ἕκαστα ἐπι-τ[έλλει]ν [ὃν τρόπον] ἀρμό[ζει]*. 372. 20, *δικαῖόν [τι]* appears an obvious supplement, but the original edition gives a lacuna of four letters. In Mitteis No. 52. 3, the addition of *εἰπεῖν* is needless; cf. 53. 10. The editor is rather too fond of such insertions. They are especially unconvincing when made in mutilated passages, e.g. 93. 27, 199. 9. To assume errors on the part of the scribe when it is quite uncertain what the scribe actually wrote is hardly ever justifiable. In 71. 6 the sense requires something like *ὡν [κατὰ] τὰς ἰδίας ἐστίας*. 83. 17-18 as well as 16 have been restored in the note on P. Oxy. 1102. 5 (not 1113, as stated in the Additions and Corrections, p. v). 155 was hardly worth printing. 213. 17, suspicion of the common *ἔτι καὶ νῦν* is gratuitous. 276. 22, *ἄβολος* as an epithet of *πυρός* = *ἄβωλος*; here 1. *ἄβ[ωλον]*.

The accuracy of the printing is so complicated and difficult a work is commendable, but a good many small slips have escaped notice.

A. S. HUNT.

#### SCIENCE IN THE GREEK UNIVERSITIES.

*The Universities of Ancient Greece.* By J. W. H. WALDEN. Pp. xiv + 367. London: Routledge and Sons, 1912. 6s.

*Greek Education.* By JAMES DREVER. Pp. viii + 107. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. 2s. net.

*The Legacy of Greece and Rome.* By W. G. DE BURGH. Pp. xii + 194 and maps. London: Macdonald and Evans, 1912. 2s. 6d. net.

THE three books, which are named above, agree in this, that they deal with the highest outcome of the antique spirit. Mr. Walden confines himself to the first five centuries after Christ, and has gathered together a good selection of details into an interesting picture. And the conclusion of his book raises just those questions, which are most profitable in estimating the achievements of the Greek universities.

What contribution was made here by the sophists? The superficial reader of Plato too often overlooks the dramatic character and therefore the exaggeration of the contrast which is drawn by him between Socrates and the sophists. The sophists should rather be represented to us by men like Isocrates. Plato symbolises his rivalry with Isocrates by the rivalry between Socrates and the more philosophic sophists, Gorgias and Protagoras. The sophist therefore should regain his position in our eyes as a professional and even a scientific teacher, if we are to draw any profitable comparison between the university life of the present, and what may be called the university life of ancient Greece.

It is curious indeed that classical studies should nowadays turn out from our English universities men who have learnt much that the Greek sophists would have taught them—

Greek literature, antiquities, composition—but have failed, like Isocrates himself, to gain command of practical oratory. Nevertheless the pupils of Isocrates, like those of Jowett and Green, turned their studies to account in after life as statesmen, orators, writers. The individualist tendency of 'sophistry' is therefore not so great as it is sometimes represented in the histories of philosophy. The sophists within certain limits actually prepared for civic life in the best sense. They were, not infrequently, constructive thinkers; the 'atmosphere' of the Athens of Isocrates was not unlike that of some of the modern university cities. The rivalry therefore of Plato and Isocrates and the sophists must not blind us to their community of purpose.

What distinguishes the Platonic method from that of Isocrates is the greater strenuousness, the more scientific character, of the former. The theoretic discipline of Plato, according to a well-based tradition, was based upon mathematics. Compared, therefore, with the schools of Isocrates and the sophists, the school of Plato has a distinctly scientific turn. For Plato himself stood in the direct succession of geometric discovery, and in making mathematics an introduction to philosophy, he was following out his own bent. The fact that he was so inclined, lends all the more importance to his description of Socrates in the *Apology*. Plato emphasises the disinclination of the historical Socrates towards astronomy. In this respect Plato sets himself in opposition to Socrates. For while Socrates rejects all pursuit of mathematics beyond what is needed for practical life, Plato, in several places, affirms that mathematics must be pursued for its own sake and not for its applications. It thus appears that the Platonic school has considerable importance for the scientific movement in Greek thought. For only as pure mathematics was developed, could the more concrete sciences be followed out to their conclusions. The contribution of Aristotle to mathematics was an indirect one; his logic enabled Euclid to bring into one system the individual discoveries which had been made in

various parts of the scientific field. Thus Plato and Aristotle are complementary in the history of science. Plato's world of ideas is a proper background for pure mathematics. Aristotle's logic of the thing and its attributes is a suitable introduction to classification and especially of living species. This genuinely scientific part of Athenian activity is treated by some writers as something confined to a coterie.

We must no longer regard Socrates and his immediate followers as if they monopolised among themselves the highest intellectual life of Athens. The *Clouds* of Aristophanes is an attack not so much upon Socrates as upon the new learning of which—against his will—he was treated as the representative. He himself had been so far influenced by the rising sciences of geometry and astronomy that the caricaturist could represent astronomical and geometrical diagrams and charts amid the outfit of his school. But a great part of Athens shared in similar studies, even although—like Socrates' disciple in the *Clouds*—they turned them to practical account.

We can now draw some important conclusions: firstly, that in Athens in the fourth century B.C. philosophy was more intimately related with science than at a later date; secondly, that under the Roman emperors, science flourished side by side with rhetoric and philosophy, especially at Alexandria. The opportunities for research at the Museum were the greatest in the world. Eratosthenes and Ptolemy may denote for us the later developments of the Greek genius on this side.

Mr. Drever's little sketch of Greek education leaves the reader with no clear idea of the actual achievements of Greek science in the Periclean age, and therefore falls short of his conclusions. Unless we take account of Greek science in its beginnings, we cannot understand the Athens of Socrates, Aristophanes and Plato, nor the education of the fourth century.

Mr. Walden carries out his programme so far as the professions of rhetoric and of philosophy are concerned. But he confines his outlook too much to Athens, and leaves out Alexandria.



It is as if one were set to describe the universities of to-day, and confined oneself to Oxford, omitting Berlin. This one-sided presentation of the past is easily understood. The tendency of the Greek mind towards science was gradually overshadowed by more pressing interests, and there came about a genuine interruption between the old and the new. Only since the renaissance can we enter into that early enthusiasm of Plato for science, upon which no practical interests had a claim. Not along the road marked out by Lord Bacon, but in the footsteps of Descartes has scientific progress been made. Euclid and Archimedes are nearer us to-day than the *Novum Organum*. It has been one of the misfortunes of culture that the universities of Greece should suggest to us only the type that is so well described by Mr. Walden. Rhetoric and poetry do not exhaust the tradition of Greece; but she has been misled by the tradition of

scholarship. 'Greece,' says Buchon, 'seems to desire above all else academicians, philosophers, and poets; later on she will procure carpenters and locksmiths.' Let us say rather, engineers and physicians. The truly Hellenic spirit welcomes the sciences as Pericles and Plato did.

Professor de Burgh has written an interesting and useful summary in his book on 'The Legacy of Greece and Rome.' But here again I miss the recognition of the whole scope of Greek grandeur. The Greek spirit anticipated the science and inventions of the present. For it took the first steps which here are more than half the way. We do not know that apart from Greece modern industrial life would have been possible. Perhaps Greece would have solved this problem with less hurt to human ideals.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

#### CICERONIS ORATIONUM SCHOLIASTAE.

*Ciceronis Orationum Scholiastae.* By T. STANGL. Vol. II. Pp. 351. Vienna (Tempsky) and Leipzig (Freytag), 1912. M. 22.

THE present reviewer, when writing a notice in the *Classical Review* (September, 1910) of Stangl's *Pseudo-Asconiana*, ventured to express the hope that this work was only the prelude to a complete edition of the Scholiasts to Cicero. It was not then known that Stangl was actually engaged upon this task, for which he was preeminently qualified by a long series of preliminary studies. The *Corpus* which has now appeared contains, in addition to Asconius, who is not a scholiast but a *vir historicus*, the Scholiasta Bobiensis, the Pseudo-Asconius, the Scholiasta Gronovianus, and some scattered scholia, among which those discovered by Dr. Peterson in the Holkham MS. 387 figure for the first time in such a collection. In addition to Vol. II. which contains the texts, are promised a Vol. I., in which questions relating to the criticism

of the authors are to be discussed with greater fullness than has been attempted hitherto.

The materials are the same for the criticism of Asconius and the Pseudo-Asconius — viz., the copies made by Poggio (*P*), Sozomenus of Pistoia (*S*), and Bartolommeo de Montepulciano (*M*). Baiter, whose edition has long been obsolete, only used descendants of *P*. The Berlin editors, Kiessling and Schoell, collated *S* and *M*, and more recently the transcript of Poggio has been identified in the Madrid MS. X. 8r. I need not refer to an edition of Asconius, for which I am myself responsible. No attempt, however, had been made to utilise the new material in the case of the Pseudo-Asconius, and here Stangl has had the field to himself. A new edition was sorely needed, since Baiter's materials were too scanty to make any scientific emendation of these very corrupt Scholia possible. The Scholiasta Bobiensis was recently edited by Hildebrand, whose work was sharply attacked on various grounds by Stangl.

It is certainly fitting that Stangl's protracted labours should result in an edition of his own.

It may be expected that I should criticise points in Stangl's edition of Asconius in which I differ from him. This, however, I am reluctant to do, since I admire Stangl's work and do not think it proper for a reviewer to 'grind his own axe.' I would merely refer to my notice of his *Pseudo-Asconiana*, in which I indicate that, while he does more than justice to Sozomenus, he is rather hard on Poggio. The subject, however, is thorny, and needs space for discussion. Also, I am at present engaged upon a fresh study of the various problems, and hope to publish some results in the near future.

Stangl's apparatus is extremely full, and includes such minutiae as the use of diphthongs or single vowels, forms of contraction employed in different MSS., varieties of punctuation, and sometimes even the division of lines. A good deal of this might be omitted without loss, especially the different contractions of *SPM*. On the other hand, he frequently omits to mention *P*, when it has the correct reading, doubtless due to a successful conjecture of Poggio, and merely gives the corruptions found in *S* and *M*. Thus we find e.g. 263. 23 *reddendam*] *dedendam* *M*: *utendam* *S*. Surely it would be better to say *dedendam* *M*: *utendam* *S*: *corr. Poggius*. We owe so much to Poggio that it would seem fair to indicate how much he did to make the text intelligible. Stangl looks with great suspicion on words omitted by *S*, which he generally prints in italics, e.g. 202. 4 *dicitur* *PM*: *om. S* in *lac.*, 242. 30 *auxilio* *PM*:

*om. S*, 261. 29 *veris* *PM*: *om. S*. He does not, however, always do so, e.g. 230. 26 *defensor*, omitted by *S*, is printed in ordinary type. He also adopts some strange readings from *S*, e.g. 217. 13 *ut videatur propter quod (hoc PM) dicere Virgilius*, which seems odd Latin even for the Pseudo-Asconius. There is, of course, no doubt that Sozomenus was the most faithful of the three transcribers, though Poggio was the most talented. There are, however, some very puzzling cases. The most perplexing, perhaps, is 241. 6 where *SM* omit the words *poscunt a pincerna petunt*, which rest solely on *P*. Stangl italicises the three first words, but, apparently by accident, leaves *petunt* in ordinary type. Who can believe that Poggio invented this supplement, containing the rare and late word *pincerna* (= butler)? The reading of *P* is itself corrupt, viz.:

*maioribus autem poculis ut subaudiatur poscunt a pincerna petunt maioribus autem poculis ut subaudiatur vivere (bibere edd.).*

Here *maioribus autem poculis ut subaudiatur* has been repeated by anticipation from what follows. If we suppose this to have been the reading of the Sangalensis, it is easy to see how a copyist came to give *maioribus autem poculis ut subaudiatur vivere (med. om.)*.

We are then met by the question, how *S* and *M* came to make the same omission. To this there is, I think, an answer, but this raises issues which I cannot now discuss. I would only say in conclusion that Stangl's stately volume is indispensable to all serious students of Cicero.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

### C. JULIUS CAESAR.

*C. Julius Caesar: Sein Leben nach den Quellen kritisch dargestellt.* Von E. G. SIHLER, Professor an der New York University. 8vo. Pp. viii + 274. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 6.

PROFESSOR SIHLER, who has long since earned a high reputation as a learned

and acute critic of Caesar, confirms and strengthens his fame by this judicial estimate of his hero's life. Nowhere will the student find the ancient evidence more carefully collected and sifted, nowhere will he find it weighed with more absolute impartiality. Yet it may be doubted if complete justice can be done to so complex a character by a

biography constructed on the lines here adopted. Cold impartiality excludes sympathy; and without sympathy the varied genius of Caesar cannot be fairly appreciated. Again, the annalistic method is as destructive of biography in the highest sense as it is of history. Admirable for a book of reference, it is fatal to a work of art. Finally, Professor Sihler deliberately refrains from any attempt to solve many of the geographical, military and political problems which confront the historian in Caesar's life. Yet to do so is to rob the life of its highest and most enduring interest.

But it is perhaps unfair to blame an author for omitting what he never professes to give. Let us rather summarize the contents of his work and draw attention to its positive merits. The greater portion of it (pp. 69-228) is a strictly annalistic narrative of Caesar's career from the formation of the first Triumvirate to his death. This is preceded by a most useful study of Caesar's early life and of contemporary Roman politics, and followed by a critical account of Caesar's own works, and by valuable if summary estimates of the commentaries which complete the story of his wars, and of the other ancient authorities for the period. It may here be noted that the German biography is a revised edition of a work originally (1911) published in English. Though there are of course corrections, the principal difference is not a correction, but an omission. In the American edition Professor Sihler criticises with trenchant force Mommsen's and Froude's eulogies of Caesar; in the German these criticisms are suppressed. It may well be that Froude's brilliant but careless and misleading sketch was deemed unworthy of notice in German, but this explanation is inapplicable to Mommsen's great work. Perhaps any attack on the greatest scholar who has written Roman history seemed *lèse majesté* to the German publisher; more probably the author himself excised this appendix as out of

harmony with the rest of his work. In it for once he abandoned his air of judicial serenity and played with vigour the part of *advocatus diaboli*.

In dealing with the ancient authorities Professor Sihler is rigidly impartial. Clearly he holds the commentaries to be of the highest historical value, yet he does not hesitate to point out that the claims advanced by Caesar that he had conquered all Gaul in 57 B.C. (p. 92), and Britain in 54 B.C. (p. 114), were in the one case premature, and in the other wholly unwarranted. He also recognises that in his Gallic commentaries Caesar is bent on proving that campaigns in appearance aggressive had in reality been forced on him by circumstances, and in his later work proclaims and exalts his own clemency to conquered Romans. Further he condemns unreservedly Caesar's massacre of the Usipetes and Tencteri, and sees the folly of the excessive honours showered on the dictator at the end of his life, and of the disdainful temper fostered by them in Caesar. In fine he rightly refuses to worship, or even to condone, the failings of his hero.

The book is in general most accurately written and carefully printed, but one or two trifling errors may be pointed out for revision. The edition of Lucan attributed (p. 260 n.) to Heitland (who wrote an interesting introduction to it) is in reality the work of C. E. Haskins; the date of Mummius (p. 265) is misprinted as 196, and Q. Cassius appears in the index as M. Cassius.

In conclusion, I should like to draw attention to the many excellent discussions to be found in the notes, e.g. that on the formation of the first Triumvirate (p. 70 f.), or that on Cicero's attitude during the early stages of the Civil War (pp. 176-7), and to repeat my opinion that no more painstaking or impartial biography of Caesar has ever been written or perhaps could be written.

W. W. How.

Merton College, Oxford.

## HISTOIRE DE LA COMÉDIE ROMAINE.

*Histoire de la Comédie Romaine*: Sur les Tréteaux Latins. Par G. MICHAUT. Pp. vi+455. Paris: Fontemoing et Cie.

THIS is a work of great learning, and written withal in a readable style. As a summary of the results of modern research and speculation, it is probably indispensable to any serious student of the Roman drama. Such a student is confronted by an enormous mass of acknowledged and co-ordinated facts, and a still vaster body of statements and suggestions which have furnished material for controversy; and if he is to see his way through a wilderness of possibilities he must have some such guidance as is supplied by M. Michaut. The early history of the Roman stage is so dark a matter that its treatment is necessarily a collation of rival hypotheses. We have a great deal of so-called information and a great many terms; but the information is often suspect, and the meaning of the terms seldom certain. What with the obscure statements of Augustan writers who did not explain what they thought everyone could understand, and the well-meant pedantry of later students (such as Diomedes or Evanthius or Isidorus) who in their desire for orderly arrangement attempted technical classification where really there must have been miscellaneous variety, and the more or less ingenious deductions of innumerable modern scholars from what they supposed Livy or Evanthius to mean, the whole study is much embarrassed. Speculation here far outruns knowledge. Certain things we may be said to know about Latin plays. We know that Plautus and Terence imitated Greek comedies, and wrote 'palliatae.' We know that 'palliatae' were only, so to speak, a 'side-show,' and that there was also a native Latin theatre, probably playing a far larger part in the life of Rome than Plautine and Terentian comedy: its nomenclature has been preserved only too well. But as the actual 'lines' (where there were any) have not been preserved to us, what more can we

be said to know really? In all the dictionary of the Roman drama there is hardly a term that can be exactly and satisfactorily defined. *Satura*, *tabernaria*, *Atellana*, *mimus*, *exodium*, *planipes*, *comoedus*, *histrio*, *hypothesis*, *paegnion*—these and many other words are nothing but fuel for controversy. What was the origin of stage-plays? What their relation to *satura* or to *Fescennini versus*? What is meant by *prologues* and *cantica*? About such problems the learned in modern times—too often, after their manner, basing their conclusions on entirely controvertible or even imaginary data, and then using the conclusion as a starting-point for further researches—do furiously rage together, and very often, it must be said, they imagine a vain thing: and since there is probably no reason to suppose that antiquity will give us any more help than it has already supplied, these battles, like the Homeric question, are likely to last for ever. It is noticeable, by the way, that English scholars have hitherto taken but little part in the combat. They have generally stood 'idle, apart, and listening to the fray': but the Continent of Europe has been a mere battlefield.

Especially in dealing with *origines*, it is M. Michaut's business to judge rival hypotheses, and clear away what is contrary to logic and common sense. There is a great deal to be done in this kind. Ancient scholars carry their praiseworthy desire for generalisation and orderly classification to inordinate lengths: what is true of one age is true of all: some plays had five acts, therefore all had: prologues are *συστατικοί*, or *ἐπιτιμητικοί*, or *δραματικοί*, or *μικτοί*, therefore what is not systatic or epitmetic or dramatic or mixed is not a prologue, in spite of all appearances to the contrary. Modern scholars are too fond of the *a priori* method: they 'cannot help suspecting' in Chapter I. that  $2+2=5$ , and this mathematical principle is wont to appear as a proved fact and a basis for reasoning in Chapter II. 'En effet, là même où ils paraissent le plus décisifs, ils soulèvent des difficultés



nouvelles. On croit y voir l'embarras d'hommes qui ont accepté une théorie en contradiction avec la réalité et qui se travaillent pour concilier théorie et réalité, sans y parvenir.' It is to M. Michaut's credit that he is not beguiled by ancient generalisation or modern hypothesis. New and old alike, he takes all with the necessary grain of common sense: if Atellanae were once acted by amateurs, it does not follow that they were so always: nor is it necessary to conclude that they were acted in Oscan (a strange imagination) because Tacitus calls them 'Oscum ludicrum.' Nor, in the absence of data, can we claim more than possibility for any conclusion. 'C'est une hypothèse: elle n'a rien d'inadmissible.' That is the temper of much French scholarship: it does not satisfy, probably, the perfervid of other nationalities. In the present book the chapter which is the best example of the author's critical

judgment is probably that on Atellanae. What is most likely to interest general readers is the following chapter, on the Mimi. These, in their long and varied history, seem to include every kind of 'piece,' from Restoration comedy to a music-hall 'turn': and though unfortunately first-hand criticism is not possible, there is so much to be had at second hand that one is in touch with reality and not merely talking about words imperfectly understood. The final chapter in the book deals with the organisation of the Roman theatre: here we are much oftener of course in the region of ascertainable fact, and the historian's business is to co-ordinate rather than to suggest: though even here any adequate notice of even a few of the controversies would go far beyond the limits of a review. M. Michaut shows a thorough familiarity with his subject, and its literature.

A. D. G.

## SHORT NOTICES

*Thucydides*. Book IV. Edited by A. W. SPRATT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge. 1 vol. Small 8vo. Pp. xx+448. Cambridge: University Press, 1912.

THIS is not the first, nor will it probably be the last of Mr. Spratt's editions of single books of Thucydides. He apologises in his Preface for the presence of elementary notes intended to 'smooth the ruggedness of the way for beginners'; and such a comment as 'νεών, the temple (the usual Attic form, cf. λεώς),' is indeed 'food for babes.' Nevertheless, there is a good deal which will be profitable to more advanced students in the grammatical notes; the difficulties of such passages as e.g. 86. 4 (where Mr. Spratt supports Bauer's ἄν σαφή for ἁσαφή) are always clearly set forth and the merits of alternative solutions impartially weighed. There seems to be some confusion in the note on 71. 1 (p. 308), which runs as follows: 'περιδεῖν, usually in the sense of "over-looking," cf. 73. 1, but here="circum-

spectare" which calls for middle, cf. v. 31. 6.' The fact is that the middle use=*circumspectare*, is illustrated by 73. 1, whilst in v. 31. 6 περιωρόμενοι is passive, if the reading be sound.

Notes on the historical subject-matter of the book are scarce, and the Introduction deals solely with the 'prelude to the Ten Years' War' and would therefore be more appropriate to an edition of Book I. This is a pity, as the narrative of the blockade of Pylos and Sphacteria (to go no further) raises interesting problems, and a discussion of them would make the study of this part of Thucydides more attractive to those for whom the book is intended. But Mr. Spratt is evidently interested in linguistic rather than historical criticism: otherwise he would not write of the Boeotarchs (p. 350) without the slightest reference to the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, nor tell us that the Lemnians and Imbrians were 'according to Grote' Athenian κληροῦχοι without giving more precise reasons for the assumption.

The text is provided with an *Apparatus Criticus* for which Mr. Spratt expressly disclaims completeness, though he informs us that he has collected the material for a critical edition of all eight books. The selection of readings is, however, not very happy, for whilst a great many unimportant variants are recorded, others are omitted which should certainly have given, e.g. ἐπιθέοντες GM in 33. 2 and προειδομένους MSS. in 64. 1 (the MS. reading is wrongly said to be προειδόμενος in the commentary, p. 291). Nor is the *Apparatus Criticus* always accurate; E, not C, is the only MS. which gives Παλλήνη correctly in 120. 1, and C does not agree with O in the reading ἔλεξε in 38. 2. The statement that Herwerden's conjecture in 62. 2 is 'backed by two good MSS.' (p. 286) is not rendered intelligible by anything in the *Apparatus Criticus*. It is derived from the note in Poppo-Stahl, which is itself based on inaccurate collations. All good MSS., not only two, read the infinitives.

Mr. Spratt has had access to the MS. notes of Shilleto's elucidations in the possession of Prof. Jackson. The present writer is glad to note that he was anticipated by Shilleto in writing ἀπροσδοκήτοις in 103. 5 in accordance with Thucydidean usage; also that in 80. 3 Mr. Spratt is 'strongly tempted to read πολέμους,' which he will likewise find in the Oxford text.

H. STUART JONES.

*The Greek Genius and its Meaning to Us.*

By R. W. LIVINGSTONE. 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. 250. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. 6s.

MR. LIVINGSTONE has succeeded in a difficult undertaking: he has produced a book of real interest both to those who have no acquaintance with Greek literature, and to those who are familiar with the writers on whom he discourses. He has done this without broaching any startling or revolutionary theories, but throughout his work there is freshness and originality. The scope of it, as Mr. Livingstone points out, is more restricted than the title would imply, and he would have preferred to call it *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius*,

had not that title been annexed by Professor Butcher. He deals merely with Greek literature down to the fourth century B.C., and only incidentally with later writers, and he gives his especial attention to those writers who are most in accordance with what he regards as essentially Hellenic, who illustrate what he styles the notes of Beauty, Freedom, Directness, Humanism, Sanity, and Manysidedness. It is because he has less of the fourth of these aspects that Plato is treated separately as to some extent an exception, though in many other respects he is the most Hellenic of writers. Mr. Livingstone has adopted a method of defining Hellenism that is itself Greek, namely, by instituting a comparison with what elsewhere is without one or other of these special features; but at times he seems to imply a censure on modern writers for not being Greek, which probably goes beyond his real intention. This is especially noticeable in the chapter on Directness. Fancy may be overdone, imagination may run riot, mystery may become melodrama, and the pathetic fallacy may cloy; yet we may sometimes feel that Greek literature is too 'classic' in the slang use of the term, and with the ideal library of a few books on a desert island we should want some which did not state the bare facts directly, but had the beauty of twilight as well as of mid-day. Even Alcman, who is praised for his nobly simple description of the sea-gull, speaks elsewhere of the mountain-tops being asleep. But it is true that Hellenism is a splendid medicine, and a true appreciation of Greek literature helps writers and readers to avoid what is ugly, turgid and morbid. Mr. Livingstone is happy in his phrasemaking: on many pages one finds such good things as: 'Existence is a prolonged somnambulism with rare moments of waking.' 'We may wear a collar, a dress-coat, or even a fancy costume, without thereby becoming insincere.' He is particularly apt in the comparisons that he makes; for instance the Jesse window of the Cathedral of Science that he imagines, with Socrates taking the place of the Jewish farmer,

and the comparison of the Greeks of the fourth century to mercenaries like Xenophon and Clearchus in the spiritual world, following in the train of the conquering race 'to educate and influence it, to amuse and instruct its leisure.' The book has already found a wide and varied public. Among its readers it is to be hoped that there will be many a sixth form boy who will be helped to see what the Greek genius can mean to him, and what it does mean to one of the wide reading and sound judgment of the author of this book.

A. S. OWEN.

*Keble College, Oxford.*

*The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction.* By SAMUEL LEE WOLFF, Ph.D. 8vo. Pp. x+526. New York: The Columbia University Press [London: Henry Frowde], 1912. 8s. 6d. net.

THIS is a piece of work well done, and it is no disparagement of it, but rather a tribute to its present achievement, that we ask for more. Dr. Wolff has studied the influence of three Greek novelists (Heliodorus, Longus, Achilles Tatius) in five Elizabethan writers (Lyly, Sidney, Greene, Nash, Lodge): we desire a study of the influence of all the Greek novelists in all the Elizabethan writers, and we believe that to have made the work thus comprehensive and complete would not have entailed any very much greater amount of labour or of space. This criticism applies in particular to the valuable analyses of the Greek romances which occupy the first fifth of the book: the three novelists analysed are just those who, by the existence of the Bohn translation,<sup>1</sup> are most accessible to the part of the community that reads only English: how much we

should like analyses of the less known and less obtainable Xenophon of Ephesus and Charito, and also perhaps some account of the kindred remains of Antonius Diogenes, who described 'the incredible things beyond Thule,' of Eumathius (have not some declared that the loves of Hysmine and Hysminias are the ultimate source of Romeo and Juliet?), of Apollonius Tyrius, and of the poor Byzantines, Theodorus Prodromus and Nicetas Eugenianus!

It will be obvious by this time that Dr. Wolff's work, which is one of a series of English studies, is being reviewed from a merely classical point of view. The unprofessional opinion of one who has read the five Elizabethan writers purely for his own pleasure (and by no means all of them at that) and with no ulterior motive, is that the influence of the Greek novelists upon them was very small. Dr. Wolff has made the most of the points of contact, which do certainly exist, and has performed with conspicuous success all that in his Preface he set out to do.

An interesting appendix gives valuable information about the unique copy of the translation of Achilles Tatius by W. B[urton], published in 1597: it was discovered in 1905 by Mr. Peddie in the library of Mr. T. A. Porter, who has allowed Dr. Wolff to consult it freely.

Dr. Wolff's general bibliography, which does not pretend to be exhaustive, will also be of use to students of the Greek Prose Romances: and it only remains to express once more the thanks of the classical scholar for this careful investigation of one aspect of an interesting bye-path of the latest age of Greek literature, which has been too much neglected in England, even by those who have professed to take a broad view of the classics down to their very latest developments.<sup>2</sup>

S. GASELEE.

*Magdalene College, Cambridge.*

<sup>1</sup> Two of them at least are known by better translations than Bohn. Underdowne's *Heliodorus* is reprinted in the *Tudor Translations*, and Angell Daye's *Shepherds Holidaye* (which is not a wholly successful representation of Daphnis and Chloe) has also been reprinted from the unique copy formerly in the Huth collection, and now in the British Museum. It is much to be hoped that the newly-discovered Elizabethan translation of Achilles Tatius, which is mentioned below, may soon also appear in modern print.

<sup>2</sup> A passing protest ought perhaps to be registered against a certain pedantry in reproducing in modern type extracts from Elizabethan writers. While it is valuable to preserve the exact spelling and punctuation of their English, it cannot be necessary to print vowels surmounted by a long mark or a *fl* instead of the *n* omitted for purely typographical reasons.

## SYNTAX IN GREEK INSCRIPTIONS.

*Griechische Forschungen I.* Die Nebensätze in den griechischen Dialektinschriften, in Vergleich mit den Nebensätzen in der griechischen Litteratur, und die Gebildetensprache im Griechischen und Deutschen. Von EDUARD HERMANN. Mit zwei Tafeln. Teubner, 1912. M. 10, cloth M. 12.

THIS volume really contains two distinct books: one, an analysis of Subordinate Clauses in non-Attic inscriptions; the other, a discussion of the question how these inscriptions are related to popular speech, whether in fact there was always a literary dialect in Greek. It is a pity that both these have been included in one volume: they are quite independent, and they must be estimated apart.

The first part of the work is excellent. Hermann arranges his matter in such a way that it is easy to understand. The pronouns and conjunctions are put in alphabetical order, the dialects in the order of Thumb's handbook, which is taken for convenience and without prejudice. Special tables are given for the Delphian manumissions; others for comparison with the dialects in literature; afterwards each pronoun and conjunction is discussed by itself, and tables show the form of each in the dialects. In all these, Attic inscriptions are left out of account, references being given for them to Meisterhans. In the very middle of these, like the meat in a sandwich, comes the other treatise. Hermann will have it that the inscription represent the speech of educated persons; and he draws a parallel with modern Germany, where those who were educated, yet spoke a dialect, always made concessions to the Schriftsprache. He gives a number of details about this matter in Germany, but they help us little in discussing Greek. He admits himself that the conditions are different; yet he sticks to his principle. But the conditions are vitally different. Printing is one, wealth and poverty is another, the size of nations another, artistic sense another. In Greece we should imagine all had a high level of education through the agora, the theatre, and the games; there was no such

thing as what Hermann has in mind. The only uneducated class were the women. The very differences of dialects, and the changes of the same dialect, go against his views. The case is different where the inscriptions are poetical; for there was a literary tradition, of course.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

*Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache* (Die Kultur der Gegenwart, Teil i., Abteilung viii). Third edition. Royal 8vo. Pp. viii + 582. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. M. 12.

*Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft.* Edited by A. GERCKE and E. NORDEN. Royal 8vo. Vols. i. and ii. Second edition. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. (Vol. i., pp. xii + 632), M. 13; (Vol. ii., pp. viii + 442), M. 9.

THE issue of new editions of the above works testifies at once to their rapid sale and to the care taken in their revision. The volume of *Die Kultur der Gegenwart* has been substantially increased by more than a hundred pages. The greater part of the new matter is to be found in Professor Wilamowitz's section on Greek Literature, in which the Attic and Hellenistic literatures in particular receive fuller treatment. The rapidity with which new editions of Gercke and Norden's *Introduction* have been called for has not required or rendered possible any considerable changes. In the first volume the chapter on *Metrik* has been enlarged, and the order of the chapters altered. The second volume has been shortened a little by the omission of part of the chapter on Greek Art. We may welcome the success of these excellent manuals and be grateful for the labour of the authors in improving them.

X.

*Altchristliche Texte.* Heft VI. of *Berliner Klassikertexte* herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung der kgl. Museen zu Berlin. By C. SCHMIDT and W. SCHUBART. Berlin, 1910.

THIS collection includes all the Greek Christian fragments on papyrus pre-



served in the Berlin Museum, except Biblical texts. Dr. Schubart's well-known skill as a decipherer of papyri guarantees sufficiently the minute accuracy of their reproduction; and his colleague, with expert knowledge in another field, secures the thoroughness of the editorial work. It can hardly be said that the contents modify greatly the sense of disappointment with which we scan the remains of Christian Egypt as preserved on the papyri. The non-literary and non-Christian documents are of endless value for lexical and grammatical study of the Greek Bible, and even for its *Realien*; but neither literary nor non-literary papyri of a definitely Christian origin give us any large amount of help. The volume has four patristic texts. Ignatius *ad Smyrnaeos* iv.-xi. (plus a few lines before and after) is presented from a codex of the fifth century, which is six centuries older than our only existing MS., and has important variants. Hermas follows (*Sim.* ii. 7-10, iv. 2-5, viii. 1) in some third-century fragments, an additional witness to his popularity in Egypt. Then come two anthologies, from Basil and from Gregory of Nyssa (both fifth century). An Easter pastoral, by Alexander, patriarch of Alexandria (seventh century), will interest students of Byzantine *Kunstprosa*, of whom, I fear, I am not one. The rest of the book (pp. 110-132) is occupied with sundry fragments, mostly liturgical, and nearly all very late. Indices to the new texts and two facsimiles complete the volume. For the philologist its interest will be mainly in the presence of accented texts, such as the *Osterfestbrief*, which was as ambitious in its form as in its style. In the

Ignatius text (l. 33) I note ΑΠΑΤΟΙ, with which the editors compare ΑΝΘΕΤΗΚΕ in the Basile excerpt (l. 69). The aspirate had vanished centuries before from pronunciation: it is interesting to see its tradition surviving in a place which our modern orthography will not recognise. Latin forms like *Euhemerus*, *Euhodius*, etc., may be compared.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

*Didsbury College, Manchester.*

*A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek.*  
By H. P. V. NUNN. Cambridge University Press, 1912. 2s. 6d. net.

MR. NUNN has written an unpretentious little book for the help of students, assuming no knowledge of grammar beyond the accident. Indeed the first twenty pages presume that even English grammar is in need of summary restatement as a basis of a reasonable understanding of Greek. The precaution is not at all needless, as many teachers will witness, when Greek enough for the reading of the New Testament has to be acquired after the atmosphere of grammar has become a memory of rather distant schooldays. I am glad to see Mr. Nunn's plea for this late and simple Greek as a desirable first step even for those who intend to pursue their studies into the classical literature. Hellenistic may be found a powerful ally for the endangered study of the Greek language and literature. Mr. Nunn's summary of syntax is simple and accurate, and based on sound teacher's instinct, which makes large use of comparison with English, and Latin in a more limited way. There are not many criticisms of detail to be suggested, and most of them are in the opening pages, before the syntax proper is reached. The example illustrating 'Diphthong' (p. x) will not help an English reader, who can recognise no diphthong in 'Caesar.' The definition of 'Deponent' verbs (p. 7) might be brought up to date; and *πεφίλησμαι* (p. 10) guarded with a remark that it is a very limited example of the Future Perfect. In the same table it is hardly accurate to deny Hellenistic the Perfect Continuous. English only has it in periphrastic form, and Greek is not devoid of this. On p. 64 I should greatly question Mark 15<sup>23</sup> as an instance of repeated action in the Imperfect ('kept giving'): *ἐδίδουν* is conative, 'offered.' The Epistolary Aorist (p. 66) is not wholly replaced by our Present: Phil. 2<sup>25</sup>, Mr. Nunn's example, might as well be rendered 'I thought it necessary to send E.' On p. 76 I notice *οἱ πολλοί* mistranslated 'many.' The misprints *tonitruum* (Acc. Sing.) (p. 88) and *εἰ τι* (p. 115) may be noted. Mr. Nunn is to

be congratulated on a sound and useful little manual.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

*Didsbury College, Manchester.*

*Opferbräuche der Griechen.* Von PAUL STENGEL. Mit 6 Textabbildungen. Teubner. M. 6; cloth, M. 7.

STENGEL has here included in one volume his scattered papers on Greek ritual. They consist chiefly of short discussions of the meaning of a number of words (the chief are *ἱερίον*, *πρωτόγονος*, *τελήεσσα ἐκατόμβη*; *θυήεις*, *θύελλα*, *θυόεις*; *θυηλαί*, *θύειν* and *θύεσθαι*; *ἐπάρχασθαι* *δεπάεσσιν*, *ἐντέμνειν*, *αἵρεσθαι τοὺς βοῦς*) and of certain details in ritual, as libation, the victim's tongue, colour and sex of victims. If they do not always contain original views, they are reasonable and give the evidence. Stengel translates *τελήεσσα ἐκατόμβη* as a sacrifice of full-grown victims; *αἵρεσθαι τοὺς βοῦς* as lifting the body, after the sacrificer had knocked the victim down with a mallet, and holding the head in the proper position. With regard to sex and colour of victims he only says enough to show that these were not always (perhaps not often) fixed. It is a pity no one has fully examined this question, and also what victims can be shown to have been offered to the various gods. Generalisations are often heard, but no one has ever collected the evidence both of literature and the bas-reliefs.

W. H. D. R.

*The Plutus of Aristophanes*, in English Verse. By LORD JUSTICE KENNEDY. Murray, 1912. 5s.

THE translation adheres very closely to the sense of the original. The style it does not reproduce with equal nicety. A translator has not done his duty well, who renders a few plain words by 'Suppose you, pray, you wrong me not in this?' as though the language were heroic, and, when he comes to *λέγεις μοι χαράν*, *λέγεις μοι βοάν* gives us the unelevated 'Glorious tidings! I could shout for joy.' The choice and order

of words, management of metre, and other matters leave something to be desired.

H. R.

*The Frogs of Aristophanes.* Translated into kindred metres by A. D. COPE. Pp. 95. Oxford: Blackwell, 1911. 3s. net.

THE *Frogs* tempts translators, and Mr. Cope has evidently enjoyed his task. He has put it as a rule into simple and natural English, though occasionally the verse seems to me to jolt or the stress to fall on words that are not quite the right ones to bear it. Some of his turns of expression and equivalents for the Greek are happy, and his 'kindred metres' give a very fair idea of the original. I append two short specimens:

416. Let's now unite our wit,  
And Archedemus his,  
Who'd got no teeth, and joined no guild,  
at seven years old.  
He's now, up overhead,  
Mob-leader of the dead,  
And comes out top in everything that's  
bad and bold.
717. It has very often struck us that our State  
behaves the same  
To those citizens of ours who best of all  
deserve the name  
As to our old-fashioned coinage and the  
gold of recent date;  
For we've ceased to use the finest coinage  
found in any State,  
Unalloyed and undebased, and stamped  
with dies that none excel  
(Such at least is our opinion), ringing clear  
as any bell,  
Coins that pass among the Greeks and  
foreigners where'er they be:  
No, instead of these we've got this wretched  
copper novelty.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

*Griechische Papyri zu Giessen.* Band I. Heft 3. Von E. KORNEIMANN und P. M. MEYER. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1912.

THE first volume of the *Giessen Papyri*, begun two years ago, is concluded by this third part, containing sixty-nine documents—of which the texts of rather more than half are printed in full—and the indispensable indices to the whole volume. As in the preceding parts, a

large space is occupied by official and private correspondence of Apollonius, strategus of Apollonopolis-Heptacomia at the beginning of the reign of Hadrian. The remainder of the texts represent different localities: Hermopolis, Oxyrhynchus, the Arsinoite nome, etc., as well as different periods. Though individually they may be of no special importance, collectively they make a considerable addition to our knowledge, still all too incomplete, of Graeco-Roman Egypt. The editors display their accustomed skill and erudition; here and there an unsatisfactory reading may be detected, e.g. in 74. 5-6, where ἐξελυθ[έναι] εἰς ὅπαντα συν Οὐλπιανῶν should obviously be ἐξελ. εἰς ὅπαν-τησιν Οὐλπ.

A. S. H.

#### POETAE LATINI MINORES.

*Poetae Latini Minores.* Post Aemilium Baehrens iterum recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Vol. II., fasc. I. Teubner, 1911.

THIS little volume includes what is left of the pseudo-Ovidian *Halieutica* and the *Cynegetica* of Grattius. It goes without saying that whatever is written by a scholar of Mr. Vollmer's eminence will deserve consideration: it goes also without saying that his results will be controversial. Mr. Vollmer's prepossessions in dealing with the text of the Latin poets are well known. If they were not, the reader has only to wait till the second verse of the *Cynegetica*, where he finds *prius omnis in armis | spes fuit et nuda silvas virtute movebant | inconsulti homines*, with the note 'armis, i. membris.' If the will to believe is inadequate, he is left to make Barth's emendation *inermis* by himself. Similar instances, only of ampler scope, crop up on most of the fifty-three pages. Mr. Vollmer works into his *apparatus* a large number of short exegetical notes—some illuminating, some unnecessary, and not a few incredible. At times they seem dictated by mere dislike of simplicity. So, for example, on *Cyn.* 83 *ne reprehensa suis propterantem linea pennis | implicit atque ipso mendosa coarguat usu*, the comment runs 'mendosa coarguat *audax* nom. c. inf.' *Auda-*

cious it certainly is, but most readers will continue to take *mendosa* as accusative plural—though Manilius still awaits an editor who will print with *L*<sup>1</sup> and *M* (II. 709) *et saepe in pecudes errant natura*. In emendation, again, when he does resort to it, Mr. Vollmer shows the defects of his qualities. His hand, too, is often heavy—witness *Hal.* 18 *uberrer nato quem texit que resulet*, where he suggests *liber ut e nassa quae texit praeda resulet*, without a word of Heinsius' *liber servato, quem texit, cive*.

The edition is, no doubt, indispensable: but so, still, are its predecessors.

J. J.

*Vitruvii de Architectura Libri Decem.* Ed. F. KROHN. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. M. 4.60.

THIS revised text is based upon a fresh collation of the four existing MSS., a task for which the editor is equipped by a thorough knowledge of Palaeography. The variants in the editions, from the *princeps* down to the most recent, have also been studied and noted; but, the number of MSS. being so small, the critical notes are of conveniently modest proportions. The edition is scholarly and conservative. In one passage the editor, by a novel punctuation, has been able to interpret the MS. reading, which was formerly abandoned to conjecture (Book VII. 7. 3). Satisfactory restorations have been made in other places by the discovery of Greek words hidden under corrupt Latin forms, e.g. λόγος ὀρικός for 'ἵlogos opticos' in I. 1. 16, ἀντολκίην for 'ἱamolcie' in IX. 1. 14, and above all Agesila for 'ἱhagest ille' in I. 1. 6. For help in this matter the editor makes a grateful acknowledgment to C. F. W. Schmidt.

The preface deals with the date of the composition, which Krohn (with Dietrich and Sontheimer) places before 31 B.C. The mention of Augustus in V. 1. 6 has been used as argument for a later date, but Krohn proves conclusively that this chapter is spurious. He finds in it no less than five ἀπαξ λεγόμενα and eight technical terms wrongly used.

It is to be regretted that the editor makes all quotations by reference to the pagination of Rose's edition, printed in the margin of the present book; whereas references to book, chapter and section—divisions which are acknowledged in the heading of each page—would be very much simpler. This deplorable habit of multiplying means of reference drives the reader to despair.

An *index nominum* concludes the book; an index of technical terms would be a valuable addition.

J. F. DOBSON.

*The University, Bristol.*

*Vitae Vergilianae recensuit* I. BRUMMER.  
Teubner, 1912.

THE most valuable portion of this book is a complete collation of all the MSS. of the Donatus Life. The editor has printed, so far as I know for the first time, three Lives from the Wolfenbüttel MS. that contains along with other matters the *Vita Bernensis*. But these three Lives are of no value. The text is not constructed on a uniform principle, for the Donatus Life is a critical text, whereas the *Noricensis* and *Monacensis* and the three worthless Lives referred to are printed from the MSS., while in *Philargyrius I.* the editor seems to hesitate between the two courses. The book is disfigured by so many misprints<sup>1</sup> that I cannot tell in all cases whether the editor is intentionally giving the false spelling or punctuation of the MSS. or is misrepresenting them. For those who do not need a very full apparatus, but want a good text, I think that Diehl has provided a much better edition than Brummer; but specialists will find the latter indispensable.

E. C. MARCHANT.

*Lincoln College, Oxford.*

*Nicodemus Frischlinus: Julius Redivivus.*  
Edited by W. JANELL. Lateinische

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *μικρός*, p. 40; *numere*, p. 42; *resindicat*, p. 48; *cartando* (?) for *coartando*, p. 55; 20 for 21, p. 63. I suspect the existence of others in the text.

*Litteraturdenkmäler des XV. u. XVI. Jahrhunderts.* Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. M. 5.

SCHOLARS have reason to be grateful to the editors of this series. They have already published a number of Latin plays and other works of importance, often difficult to get for those who have an interest in non-classical Latin. If *Julius* is not so attractive as *Acolastus*, or the sprightly *Veterator* (well known to the stage in another form), or our own *Histriomastix*, it has an indirect value for the schoolmaster, as we shall see anon.

Julius Caesar and Marcus Tullius Cicero come on exeat from the shades to visit Germany: and the plot turns on the contrast between what Germany was in their day and what she is in Frischlin's day. There is properly no plot: but a series of scenes, more or less amusing. It must be admitted that the two heroes are not recognisable except by their names; Caesar would hardly have been frightened by a chimney-sweep even before his long residence in Hades. But the setting is instructive. There are a good many passages that throw light on social or political conditions; and if the satire on contemporary scholars has lost its point, where else shall we find a minute description in Latin of paper-making and printing, not to mention weapons of war and their use? Here the enterprising schoolmaster may find something to work off on his boys.

Cicero is naturally surprised to find Hermann conversing with him fluently in Latin. He explains why:

at haec lingua hodie totum orbem fere occupavit, hac doctissimi quique in Germania Gallia loquuntur, hac loquuntur Dani atque Hungari.

Would that the same could be said now! Hermann's metrical knowledge is perhaps not equal to his colloquial skill, but that may be forgiven him.

An elaborate introduction tells us all that the human heart can desire about Frischlin, als Mensch, als Dramatiker, als Philolog: there is a bibliography, and there are notes.

W. H. D. R.



*Studien zur Odyssee. II. Odysseus der Bhikshu.* Von CARL FRIES. 1 vol. 10" x 6½". Pp. viii + 215. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1911. M. 6.

THE author of this work is an accomplished Orientalist who holds strongly the view that ancient Hellas was influenced by the cultures of the East. In his *Griechisch-orientalische Untersuchungen* he traced certain parallelisms between Homer and the books of the Old Testament, but these studies in the *Odyssey* are more ambitious efforts. The first of them, which was published, like the present treatise, in the *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, was entitled *Das Zagmukfest auf Scheria*, and had for its subject Odysseus' stay in Phaeacia. An endeavour was made to show that this was no mere incident, but represented a yearly recurring 'act of culture-life,' in which the 'calendar-god' was duly honoured with procession and music, and with ball-play pointing to an astral origin. In the present work Dr. Fries

turns his attention to the hero's return to and experiences in Ithaca. But these are the subject of only the thirty final pages of the volume. The rest of it contains a learned presentation of the facts and phenomena of *Askese* or asceticism in its many forms, in many ages and in many lands, almost literally from China to Peru; and the folklorist and the anthropologist will find in it a great wealth of interesting information. The Homerist, we think, will rise from its perusal quite unconvinced that a special vein of asceticism is to be detected in the *Odyssey*, or that the conduct of Odysseus after his arrival in Ithaca 'suits the situation as badly as possible.' Dr. Fries himself admits that the hero 'has not renounced the world.' That he became a *bhikshu* or mendicant for a time is plain enough, but surely the reason given in the epic is a sufficient explanation of the fact. In a word the conclusion seems far-fetched, and the author, when he deprecates a hasty adverse judgment, would appear to anticipate this effect on his readers.

A. S.

## NOTES AND NEWS

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY has done itself honour in doing honour to Mr. T. E. Page, who received the degree of Litt.D. at the last convocation. Mr. Page has spent his life in fighting for the teaching profession; he has received the wounds, and others are reaping the benefits, which perhaps they do not realise that they owe to him. His edition of the Acts of the Apostles is a model for professed theologians which they would do well to imitate, and his other works stand out as teaching-books in a class by themselves.

In the present year, we believe for the first time, the importance of Latin quantities will be recognised practically in English University examinations. We understand that in the pass examinations of Liverpool University the unprepared translations appear with

all the long vowels marked. At the same University experiments have been made with the object of making the direct method an integral part of its teaching; but although a lively interest has been awakened, progress is somewhat hindered by the very inadequate grounding of many of the students in the elements of accidence and syntax.

Attention may be directed to the *Classical Weekly* (New York) for May 24, in which Mr. J. H. Denbigh discusses the causes why there is 'lack of success in the teaching of classics.' He has summarized the work of candidates for college entrance, and finds that between 1901 and 1912, all the classical percentages have been going down, the Greek steadily (from about 15 per cent. to 4 per cent. for Xenophon, 11 per cent. to 2

per cent. for Homer), Virgil steadily (28 per cent. to 19 per cent.), Cicero (32 per cent. to 28 per cent.). French and German have risen on the whole, by spasmodic bursts up and down; but apparently every one is going for the soft options.

The Melbourne *Argus* for June 18 contains half a column upon Greek! It is a report of a debate in the University Senate. Greek, of course, as in all progressive communities, has become in Melbourne, first voluntary, then extinct—at least, it was becoming extinct, when Dr. Leeper hit on a plan. He proposed to the council, and carried through the council and the senate, that in matricula-

tion Greek should count as two subjects. The sacred principle then is saved, that no subject in the arts course should be compulsory, and yet Greek is made a soft option. An opposing speaker pointed out that 'this would have an instantaneous effect on the schools, and probably 70 per cent. of candidates for the junior public examination, most of whom would not proceed to the University, would study Greek.' We congratulate Dr. Leeper on this brilliant stroke, by which he makes a friend of the mammon of unrighteousness. To those who have been prophesying the extinction of Greek in English schools if Greek becomes a hard option, it is interesting to see the Australian method of argument.

## VERSION

WHEN 'Omer smote 'is bloomin' lyre,  
He'd 'eard men sing by land an' sea;  
An' what 'e thought 'e might require,  
'E went an' took—the same as we!

The market-girls an' fishermen,  
The shepherds an' the sailors too,  
They 'eard old songs turn up again,  
But kep' it quiet—same as you!

They knowed 'e stole; 'e knowed they  
knowed;  
They didn't tell nor make a fuss,  
But winked at 'Omer down the road,  
An' 'e winked back—the same as us!

KIPLING.

Ἀδόντων μὲν Ὀμηρος ἔμ-  
πειρος ἦν κατὰ γῆν τε καὶ  
πασῶν κλεινοτάτῃ πλέων  
σὺν φόρμυγγι θάλατταν·  
εἰ δ' ἔξεν τινὸς ἦτο  
χρεῖαν ὕστερον, αὐτίκ' ἂν  
ἤθελ', ὥσπερ ἐγώ, λαβὼν  
εἰς δέον καταθέσθαι.

λαχανοπώλισιν οὖν συνὼν  
καὶ ναύταισι διηγ' αἰεὶ  
καὶ συχοῖς ἀλιεύσι καὶ  
ποιμέσιν κατὰ χώραν,  
οἷς ἀρχαῖα σαφῶς μελω-  
δῶν εἰ τίς ποτε δῆλος ἦν,  
οἱ δ', ὥσπερ σύ, καλῶς ἀνα-  
γνωρίσαντες ἐσίγων.

καὶ κλέπτοντα μὲν ᾔδεσαν,  
εἰδότες δ' ἄρ' ἐμάνθανεν,  
ὥς δ' οὐκ ἄξιον ἦν βοᾶν  
οὐδ' ἄγαν χαλεπαίνειν,  
ἡσύχως ἐτίθεντο πρὸς  
ταῦτα καὶ μετρίως γέλω-  
θ' οἱ τ' ἄλλοι πολύν, ὥσπερ ἡ-  
μεῖς, αὐτός θ' ὁ ποιητής.

H. RICHARDS.

Wadham, Oxford.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Publishers and Authors forwarding books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.*

*\*\* Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

- Adam (A. M.)** Plato: Moral and Political Ideals (Cambridge Manuals).  $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. vii + 159. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Cloth, 1s. net.
- Allen (P. S. and H. M.)** Erasmi Epistolae. Tome III., 1517-1519.  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$ . Pp. xxxviii + 641. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Anrich (G.)** Hagios Nicolaos. Band I. Die Texte.  $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. xvi + 464. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 18.
- Ballou (Susan Helen)** De Clausulis a Flavio Vopisco Syracusio Scriptore Historiae Augustae adhibitis (Doctor's Dissertation).  $9'' \times 6''$ . Vimarinae: Formis Wagnerianis, 1912.
- Booker (J. M.)** The French Inchoative Suffix *iss* and the French *ir*-Conjugation in Middle English. Studies in Philology, published under the direction of the Philological Club of the University of North Carolina. Vol. IX.  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 1 + 110. Chapel Hill: The University Press, 1912.
- Bouchier (E. S.)** Life and Letters in Roman Africa.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. vi + 128. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1913. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Cäsars Feldzüge in Gallien und Britannien.** By T. Rice Holmes, W. Schott, and F. Rosenberg.  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. xiv + 299. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 9.
- Church Quarterly Review.** Edited by the Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D. January, 1913, Vol. LXXVI., No. 150, pp. 256. April, 1913, No. 151, pp. 257-508. July, 1913, No. 152, pp. 509-760.  $8\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5\frac{3}{4}''$ . Spottiswoode. 3s.
- Cicero (Orator).** Von Otto Jahn (W. Kroll).  $8'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 228. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 2.80.
- Clark (A. C.)** Prose Rhythm in English.  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 20. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. 1s. 6d. net.
- Classical Association Proceedings** (January, 1913). Vol. X.  $8\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. 215. London: John Murray, 1913. 2s. 6d. net.
- Classical Philology**, January, 1913. Vol. VIII., No. 1.  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. 132. Chicago: University Press. Subscription \$2.50, foreign \$2.75.
- Clementi (C.)** Bibliographical and other Studies on the Pervigilium Veneris.  $9'' \times 7''$ . Pp. 54. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1913. 3s. net.
- Commentationes Aenipontani quas edit E. Kalinka.** VII. De enuntiatis graecorum finalibus scr. I. Knuenz. Pp. 48. VIII. De Compositione Numerosa Dialogi Ciceronis de Amicitia, scr. I. Blum. Pp. 80.  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Ad Aeni Pontem. 1913.
- Cornelius Nepos.** Von K. Nipperdey. Elfter Auflage (K. Witte).  $8'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 299. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 3.40.
- Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.** Vol. LXII. S. Ambrosii Opera, Pars V.: Expositio Psalmi CXVIII, Recensuit M. Petschenig.  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$ . Pp. xii + 538. Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1913. M. 16.
- Cug (E.)** Un nouveau document sur l'Apokéryxis.  $11'' \times 9''$ . Pp. 64. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1913. Fr. 2.60.
- Dewhurst (W.)** Wanted: A Ministry of Fine Arts.  $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. viii + 101. London: Hugh Rees, 1913. 1s. net.
- Drerup (E.)** Das fünfte Buch der Ilias.  $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. viii + 451. Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1913. M. 7.40.
- Euripides (Rhesus)** Translated into English Verse by Gilbert Murray.  $7\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. xii + 67. London: Geo. Allen and Co., 1913. Cloth, 2s. net.
- Fessler (F.)** Benutzung der Philosophischen Schriften Ciceros durch Lactanz. Ein Beitrag zur klassischen Philologie.  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. viii + 56. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 2.50.
- Fitzhugh (Thomas)** Indo-European Rhythm. University of Virginia Bulletin of the School of Latin, No. 7.  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 202. Charlottesville, Va.: Anderson Bros. \$3.
- Jéquier (G.)** Histoire de la Civilisation Egyptienne.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 330. With 265 illustrations. Paris: Payot et Cie., 1913. Fr. 3.50.
- Jones (H. L.)** Songs of a Buried City.  $7'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 46. Illustrated. London: J. M. Dent, 1913. Cloth, 1s. net.
- Keller (Otto)** Die Antike Tierwelt. Vol. II. Pp. 618. With 161 illustrations and two photographic plates of coins. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1913. M. 17; bound in cloth, M. 18.50.
- Laurand (L.)** Apropos d'Homère, Progrès et Recul de la Critique.  $7'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 76. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1913. Fr. 2.
- Lowe (W. D.)** Tales of Great Generals: Selections from Cornelius Nepos.  $6\frac{3}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 96. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Martindale (C. C.)** In God's Nursery.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. x + 238. London: Longmans and Co., 1913. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Meltzer (O.)** Geschichte der Karthager. Dritter Band (218-146) mit zwei Karten.  $9'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. xii + 690. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 20.
- Monist (The)** A Quarterly Magazine devoted to the Philosophy of Science. Vol. XXIII., No. 3. July, 1913.  $10'' \times 8''$ . Pp. 321-480. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company. 2s. 6d.

- New Testament MSS. in the Freer Collection.* Part I.: The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels, by Henry A. Sanders. 11" x 8". Pp. 248, with plates. New York: Macmillan Co.
- Nicklin* (T.) A Greek Vocabulary for the use of Schools. 7" x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii + 103. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Owen* (E. C. E.) A Brief History of Greece and Rome. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 313. London: Blackie and Son, 1913. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Pantheon.* Vol. I., No. 1. Edited by Paneumolpos. 11" x 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 48. London: 289, Regent Street, 1913. 1s. 3d.
- Pater* (W.) Marius the Epicurean. In 2 vols. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 146 + 134. London: The Medici Society, 1913. Cloth, £1 10s. net.
- Philipp* (H.) Die historisch-geographischen Quellen in den Etymologie des Isidorus von Sevilla. Teil II. (Heft 26. Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie.) 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 236. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 8.
- Phormio.* Ausgewählte Komödien des P. Terentius Afer: Erstes Bändchen, von Edmund Hauler. Mit zwei Tafeln. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. xvi + 288. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 4.80.
- Pistorius* (Hans) Beiträge zur Geschichte von Lesbos im IV. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Jena: Historische Arbeiten, her. von A. Cartellieri und W. Judeich, Heft 5. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 178. Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1913.
- Plinius.* Briefe II Teil, Kommentar, mit 2 Abbildungen im Text. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 120. Wein: F. Tempsky, 1913. Cloth, M. 1.20.
- (Briefe) Second and Revised Edition. Vol. I., Text. By M. Schuster. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 167. Illustrated. Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1913. Cloth, M. 1.50.
- Postgate* (J. P.) Sermo Latinus: Key to Selected Passages. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. iv + 132. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1913. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Proreceptor.* By S. O. Andrew. Lingua Latina Series, Master's Book. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 104. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Proceedings of the Classical Association of Scotland,* 1912-13. 8" x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. vi + 132. Edinburgh: Pilleus and Wilson, 1913. Cloth.
- Reid* (J. S.) The Municipalities of the Roman Empire. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xvi + 548. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Cloth, 12s. net.
- Sandys* (Sir J. E.) A Companion to Latin Studies. Second Edition. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. xxxv + 891. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Scott-Moncrieff* (P. D.) Paganism and Christianity in Egypt. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. x + 225. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Steiner* (A.) Der Fiskus der Ptolemaier. 9" x 6". Pp. vi + 66. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 2.40.
- Teubner's Texts.* Sexti Pompeii Festi de Verborum Significatione (W. M. Lindsay), pp. xxviii + 574, M. 12. Aristotelis de Animalium Motione. etc. (Jaeger), pp. xxi + 64, M. 2. Poetae Latini Minores (Vollmer), Vol. II., Fasc. 3, pp. x + 65, M. 1.50. Julii Firmici Materni Matheseos (Kroll and Skutch), Lib. VIII., pp. lxx + 559, M. 12. Marci Antonii Imperatoris in semet ipsum (Schenkl), Lib. XII., 2 vols., editio major, pp. xl + 267, M. 4.80; editio minor, pp. x + 168, M. 2. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913.
- Teufel* (J.) Zur Geschichte der Frauenemanzipation im alten Rom. (Eine Studie zu Livius 34 1-8.) 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 43. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 1.
- The Nation's Library.* First six volumes: Eugenics (E. Schuster), Socialism and Syndicalism (P. Snowden), Industrial Germany (W. H. Dawson), Small Holdings (J. Long), Education (Thiselton Mark), Some Trade Unionism (W. V. Osborne). 7" x 4". London: Collins' Clear Type Press, 1913. Cloth, 1s. net each.
- Theocritus* (Bion, Moschus) Translated into English Verse by A. S. Way. 9" x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. viii + 160. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Thucydides Reliquiae* in papyris et membranis Aegyptiacis servatae. Collegit F. Fischer. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. vi + 75. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 3.
- Tolkiehn* (J.) Dosithei Ars Grammatica. 9" x 6". Pp. 112. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1913. M. 3.
- Topham* (J.) Latin Self-Taught (Thimm's System). 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 144. London: E. Marlborough, 1913. Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.
- Usener* (H.) Kleine Schriften (Zweiter Band). Arbeiten zur Lateinische Sprache und Literatur. 9" x 6". Pp. 382. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 15.
- Verrall* (A. W.) Collected Literary Essays. With a Memoir, pp. cxiv + 292. Collected Studies in Greek and Latin Scholarship, pp. viii + 372. Edited by M. A. Bampfield and J. D. Duff. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net per vol.
- Vives on Education.* By Foster Watson. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. clvii + 328. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Wagener* (A. P.) Popular Associations of Right and Left in Roman Literature, by A. P. W. (Doctor's Dissertation.) 9" x 6". Pp. 60. Baltimore: J. H. Furst, 1912.
- Weigel* (F.) (1) Curtius von Hartel Griechische Schul-Grammatik, 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ", pp. 298, M. 3. (2) Griechisches Übungsbuch für Gymnasien, 9" x 6", pp. 328, M. 3.30. Wien: F. Tempsky, 1913.